Cotner School of Religion
Lincoln 8, Nebraska

Colner School of Religion
Lincoln 8, Nebraska

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

EDITED BY

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come; and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail!

VOL. II.

BETHANY, VA.

Printed and published by the Editor.

MDCCXXXI.

1831

Published
by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
600 North Rossmore
Hollywood 4, California

Cotner School of Religion
Lincoln 8, Nebraska

INDEX TO VOL. II.

A

ADVOCATES of systems, not systematic, 378
Alumnus—'*Orders is Heaven's first law,*' 123
Anecdote of George III. 186
Anti-Reform Morality, 183
Apocalypse, Croly on, 216
Apology to Vindex, 177
Apologies by the Editor, 381
Apostacy, 542
Apostacy and Reform, 305
Archippus on Remission of Sins, or Gentile Baptism, No. 1, 156
No. 2, 297
No. 3, 337
No. 4, 504
Archippus, Replies to, No. 1, 159
No. 2, 233
No. 3, 266
No. 4, 301
No. 5, 342
No. 6, 404
Ark and Dove, 559
Argument, new, against Reform, 564
Association, Baptist, Chemung, 189
Association, North District, Circular of, 452
Atheism, weakness of, refuted, 513

B

Bachellor Origen, letter from, 145
Baptism, Gentile, 156
Baptism of John, of Water and Spirit, 504
Baptisms, 56
Baptist Chronicle, 38
Particulars, 187
Barnes of Philadelphia, 478
Book, a little one, a great blessing, 282
Brantly, William, in an agony, 37
Prophecy of, 105
Broaddus, Andrew, notice of, 106
Notice of, 190
Extra Examined, 424

C

Calumnies circulated in Ireland, 527
Calvin, John, Will of, 420
Campbellism, 220
Remarks on, by F.P. 221
Candor, 46
Ceylon, Religion of, 353
Change, Real and Relative, 524
Clack, Spencer, 333
Clergy, time-serving, 106
Clerical Denunciations, 534
Challenge from John Bryce, 189
Church in Wellsburg, letter from, 97
in Nashville, 121
Reform, 136
Churches of Asia, what now, 432
Churches, Co-operation of, No. 1, 235
No. 2, 141
No. 3, 243
No. 4, 435
Churches in the U. S. in 1831, 546
Christian Index, Letter to, on Temperate Societies, 429
Cohen, a Jew, Apology of, 346
Letter to, No. 1, 350
No. 2, 422
No. 3, 465
No. 4, 539
Conclusion of Volume 2, 566
Correction of a Statement concerning A. W. Clopton, 143
Correction of Erroneous Statements, 185
Correspondents, Hints to, 432
Counterfeits in Religion, 310
Creator, there is a, 145
Creeds opposed only as terms of communion, 378
Croly on the Apocalyse, 216

D

Deaf and Dumb, baptism of, 547
Decorum, hints on, 271
Reply to, 272
Decrees, Semple and Broaddus', 76
Rejection of, 178
Delusions, 85
Depravity, total, by Moses, No. 1, 222
No. 2, 223
No. 3, 360
Dialogue on the Holy Spirit, No. 1, 289
Dialogue on the H. Spirit, No. 2, 363
No. 3, 396
No 4, 461
No. 5, 524
No. 6, 553
Dietetic Maxims, 560
Diseases, causes of, 562
Discovery, new, 138
Dwight, Timothy, D. D. in favor of *rum*, 239

E

Ecclesiastical Shakings, 476
Extra Examined, by Andrew Broaddus, 424
Experience, religious, of a Visionary, 403

F

Fenwick, B. J. *versus* the Calvinists 106
Fabier on the Prophecies, 555

G

Gill, Dr. *versus* the Proceedings of Reformers, 274
Great Men, the end of, 317

H

Henley, Thomas M. letter from, 275
To Bishop Semple, 323
Letter from, 408
Extracts forwarded by, 439
——————— 492
——————— 548
Not Excluded, 534

I—J

Immersion, a new argument for, 6
Christian, ridiculed, 557
Infidels in France, 547
Journal of Health, 107

K

Kiss, Holy, 412

L

Laws, Divine and Human, compared, 447
Laws of Interpretation, No. 1, 488

M

Magazine, Baptist Tract and Youths' do. 330
Marriage, No. 1, 139
No. 2, 202
Queries on, 142
Marshall, Humphrey, Esq. Letter to, No. 3, 16
No. 4, 70
No. 5, 150
No. 6, 258
No. 7, 370
Letter from, 370
Notice of, 523

N

Napoleon's Sacrifice of Life, 552
Nashville, Tour to, No. 2, 19
No 3, 24
No. 4, 29
No. 5, 54
No. 6, 109
Extracts from Grotius and Le Clerc, by T. M. Henley, No 1, 408
No 2, 439
No. 3, 492
No. 4, 548
No. 5, 550

F

Faith and Remission of Sins, by John, 441

G

Grotius and Le Clerc, views of, 408
Griffing's Renunciation, 325

H

Holy Scriptures, renunciation of, 35
Remarks on, 36
Holy Spirit, Dialogue on, in six parts, 289, 363, 396, 461, 524, 553
Holy Spirit, Discourse on, by Walter Scott, 480
Home Labor, 282
Hydrophobia and its Cure, 427

I—J

Jennings, Obadiah, discussion with, 109
Notice of, 333
Jews in China, 546
Isaiah liii. translated by Lowth, 541

K

Kiss, Holy, 474

L

Led by the Spirit, 230
Little Things, 104
Lying Spirit of this Age, 215

M

Messsenger, Christian, 627
Meeting, General, at New Lisbon, 445
Millennium, 165
Minutes, Franklin, 334
Missionary Society, Presbyterian Home Establishment, 316
Success in India, 330
Miracles improbable, 379
Certainty of, 374
Modern Pentecosts, 334
Mormonites, and Bible of, 86
Mormonism, 331
In Vermont, 356

N

Nashville, Tour to, No. 7, 172
New Version, sustained by the Bishops' Bible, 520
Noel's Holy Spirit, 143
No Juvenis, 180
Nomenclature, new, 209

O

Observer & Telegraph, notice of, 457
Opinion, 101
Order, the first law of Heaven, 128
Owen, Robert Dale, letter to, 145

P

Parthenos on Marriage, 139
Remarks on, 206
Paul's translation of the Epistle to the Romans anticipated by W. T Brantly, 332
Paul and Faith Ridiculed, 358
Personal Effort, 283
Persecutions, Sceptical, 433
Philalethes, 29
——— 128
————on Matheteuo, 228
————Remarks on, by John, 509
Popular Preaching and Systems, the inefficiency of, 164
Porter's Health Almanac, 565
Practices, unseasonable and dangerous, 383
Prayer, No. 1, 460
No. 2, 497
Progress of Reform in Georgetown, Ky. 544
Prophecies, No. 6, 33
No. 7, 133
No. 8, 261
Prosecution for Irreligious Opinions, 495

Q

Query, 432

R

Reason Examined by Interrogaries, No. 1, 485
Re-baptism, 481
Regeneration, No. 8, 246
Regeneration, Metaphysical, by Moses, No. 1, 222
No. 2, 223
No. 3, 364
Reform, Progress of, 333
Reformers, Address to, 417
The first, 220
Religious Herald, Letter to, 248
Remarkable analogy between the arguments now and in Luther's time, for and against reformation, 168
Do. between Jewish Doctors and modern Creed Makers, 171
Remission of Sins—by John, 441
Report, an evil one, corrected, 426
Complained of by the Universalists, 529
Revival at Georgetown, Ky. 179
Rider and Booth, 523
Rigdon, Sidney, 100

S

Saints' Feet, washing of, 411
Scripture Harmony, 514
Shelbourne, Silas, to Abner W. Clopton, 326
Semple, R. B. Letter from, No. 2, 8
Letter to, No 1, 11
No. 2, 67
No. 3, 174
Letter from No. 3, 193
Letter to, No. 4, 187
No. 5. 321
Bishop Semple, T. M. Henley to, 323
Sentinel and Star, attack of, 529
Response to, 531
Sin, History of, No. 7, 252
No. 8, 318
Spirit of the Age, 430
Statistics of Great Britain, 479
Sprinkling decided by a lean majority, 565
Suicide, 665

T

Times, No. 2, 73
No. 3, 76
No. 4, 211
No. 5, 269
Times, No. 6, 324
Time, 428
Thompson W. Z. Letter from and to, 460

U

Unfairness, 107
Union, from the C. Messenger, 385
Union, Remarks on, 389
Universalism, five points of, 192

V

Vindex, Apology to, 177 Vaughan Wm. and Imprecations, 181

W

Warder, William, 143 Wilkinson, Jemima, Narrative of, 278
Wales, Good News from, 421 Word, the living and effectual, 184
Williams, Samuel, of Pittsburg, a New Discovery of, 183 Worship of Moloch, 229
Worship, Hints on, 363

ANALYSIS OF THE EXTRA DEFENDED.

Baptism, as a mutual pledge, examined, - - - - 1
Inefficiency of evangelical writers, - - - - - 2
We begin with the heart, - - - - - - 3
Impotency of popular notions upon the heart, our main objection against them, - - - - - - - - 4
First capital error of the examiner, - - - - 7
Real and relative change, - - - - - - 8
Second capital error, "baptism an outward bodily act," - 11
Third capital error, faith an essence, - - - - 12
General remarks upon the theory of Andrew Broaddus, - 17
————Upon my own reasonings, - - - 19
State and character, - - - - - - - 21
Influence of state illustrated by analogy, - - - - 21
Andrew's argument put into the mouth of a Deist, - - 23
Regeneration defined, - - - - - - - 24
Stuart to Dr. Channing on interpretation, - - - 25
Ernesti and Horne on interpretation, - - - - 26
Michaelis, Dwight, and the Westminster Divines in full agreement with the doctrine of the Extra on the import of John iii. 5. and Titus iii. 5. - - - - - - - - 30
Adam Clarke in attendance, - - - - - - 32
Conversion, - - - - - - - - - 34
Paul, no Baptist, - - - - - - - - 36
Testimony of the Fathers, - - - - - - 36
Fate of my 12 Propositions, - - - - - - 38
The evidence on which we rely, - - - - - 40
Illustration by analogy of the *seven* causes of justification, - 42
The reformed confessions in attendance, - - - - 45
Paul and Peter cross-examined, - - - - - 48

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 1. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY*, JANUARY 3, 1831. Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

PREFACE.

THE first thought of the Almighty Maker of this stupendous universe, in reference to this system, was the ultimate and ineffable glory and bliss of his rational offspring. When creation is contemplated in accordance with the character of its Great Architect, this idea suggests itself to the mind. The most august palace ever reared by human hands, was for the residence of him who designed it. His splendid and happy inhabitation was the first thought in the designer; and, in subordination to this, was the whole scheme originated and conducted. That which was first in the design is, however, always last in the execution. For although the Prince first thought of his magnificent abode in the castle which he erected, it was not till every thing pertaining to its perfect completion was accomplished, that he made it the mansion of his glory. The painter's last touch precedes the entrance of the illustrious resident. The first thought is the end, and the first act the beginning of all things.

Before the real temple of Jehovah will be perfected and the city of the Great King ready for his reception, the scaffolding must be consumed. But the Most High God dwells not in temples made by human hands. He builds a temple for himself. And that temple will be the purified and glorified spirits of the saints. They are the materials of God's own house. "I will dwell among them and walk in them," says the Almighty. But all the saints shall be placed as stones in this heavenly temple before its gates are opened, before the New Jerusalem descends from the present heaven, and becomes the new and eternal mansion of Nature's Immortal King Hence the general conflagration of the scaffolding of the works of nature and of grace is, in the visions of future things, to precede the first note of the eternal song to him who will inhabit thenceforth the new praises of eternity.

The material systems are but the scaffoldings to the different stories of the heavenly temple of many mansions. As respects our race it is nature first, grace second, and glory third and last of all. When all the lumber of seven thousand years shall have been consumed, and the dome of glory everlasting perfected, the first thought of the

Great Contriver shall be intelligibly expressed to the universe of glorified reason. God, *all in all*, is the chorus of the eternal song. The tongues which sing it not shall be eternal mutes. Every opposing mouth shall be stopped, when the great consummation vindicates the plan and progress of the supreme government of all systems. Let us, then, kiss the Son, be silent, and adore.

Man was made in the image of God, His little creations are imitations of the Great Creator. We form designs and attempt their accomplishment. Our first thought is the end of our efforts; and if we live to perfect our plans, we do no more than give expression to the first idea. The volume cannot be read till the last word is written; but the reading of it is always in the intention of the writer. The effect to be produced is the ultimatum in his intention who writes a book. He thinks that he may write, and writes that it may be read; but the reading is solicited for the end proposed to himself.

When our bodies are immersed in water and our souls into the Holy Spirit, our plans are all religious. If we value intelligence, it is for its purifying tendencies; if we value purity, it is for its blissful termination. Bliss is our goal—intelligence and purity is the race-course.

Human happiness is our end and aim in all our editorial labors. But as in the scheme of Heaven wickedness must be punished, and the wicked afflicted; so in the most benevolent designs those who oppose the way of righteousness must be chastised, were it only by the exposure of their schemes.

We still flatter ourselves that we shall have less occasion for the invective, and more room for the developement of the renovating truth. It is always, however, difficult to remove the rubbish without raising the dust; and the Babel repairers have always obstructed the rebuilding of the Lord's city and his earthly temple. But as the demolition of Mystery Babylon keeps pace with the restoration of Jerusalem which is from above, our opponents will be much engaged in repairing the breaches in their own walls, they will have less time to annoy us. Sanballat and his deacon Tobias, are busied much in their own affairs; for in their own camp discord has arisen.

We shall have little occasion to reason with our opponents; for the reasoning part of them are either silenced or convinced that they were premature in their opposition. And from the last advices it seems that those who are employed to oppose us have received a charge not to presume to reason with us. In this work we can neither rival nor imitate them; for this our cause requires not, and our King forbids.

Kind nature has given, as Anacreon saith, to each animal a defensive weapon, from which it has withholden an offensive one. Timidity is to the sheep what horns are to the goat; the swiftness of foot of the hare is its shield against the teeth of the dog; to the lion she has given teeth and paws; to the ox, horns; to the horse, his hoof; and *to the wild cat, its musk*. Each, when attacked, relies for protection upon its natural armor of defence. Truth has *argument*; and error,

vituperation and *anathema* for its defence. The only legitimate defence of truth is argument; and while our opposers rely upon slanders, reproaches, and anathemas, we must rely upon the *records of truth*, and that reason which is the strength of man.

Reason, we repeat, is the strength and dignity of man. He who has to employ another weapon in his own defence, degrades himself as well as his cause. Cannons are the last reason of kings, it is said; but this is an abuse of speech. Brutal force might as justly be called the eloquence of a highwayman. The anathema of a clerical council and the denunciations of a mercenary press are the last reasons of errorists: but these, like cannon balls, are not addressed to the understanding, nor the conscience; but to the animal fears of men.

The press is as venal as the pulpit, when error is to be propagated; and when passion and pride are to be gratified, a falsehood or a malediction is more suitable than the Sermon upon the Mount. Satan's kingdom has been built up by lies, as uniformly as that of the Messiah by truth. In the controversy about the body of Moses, Michael reasoned, but did not slander nor revile: while Satan reviled and did not reason. Ever since error was believed among men, it has been sustained by the same means by which it was first introduced.

By some strange fatality the opposers of reform have always defeated themselves. It is true they formerly succeeded in keeping a part of their kingdom from an apostacy from error. Those who succeeded in opposing Luther, succeeded in keeping up the superstitions of popery; and the children of them who opposed him are now inheriting their fathers' errors. In this way their gain was the loss and ruin of their own posterity. What they lost of their kingdom was little in comparison of what they lost in their own persons and families. In every war against the New Testament the loss is loss, the gain is loss, and every victory is a defeat. Thus error always defeats itself.

Men are never more deceived than in their calculations upon success in opposing reformation principles. Even after their battles are wisely planned, their preliminary schemes successful, and victory in sight, the trophies often recede from the eye, and the crown from the touch of the confident aspirant. No doubt that Herod felt himself secured in his throne, and obtained a quietus to his fears after the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem. But he knew not that the infant whose death alone he meditated was sleeping securely in Egypt.

When the chief priests, at the head of an exasperated populace, sustained by a Roman governor, had crucified the Prince of Life, they rejoiced that victory was won, and their lordship over the people retained in spite of the wonderful revolutionist. But transient was their joy, and short-lived their exultations! The dead Jesus is found instructing his disciples to wage a more successful war against the rulers of the darkness of this world. The Apostles alarm the Sanhedrim by the thousands who heard them gladly, and they began to

machinate anew against these propagators of what they called the odious heresy. The ringleaders, Peter and John, are thrust into prison. The heretics secured, the priesthood again exult. Their joy, however, is soon turned into sorrow. To-morrow morning the prisoners are speaking to the people, and the people still hear them gladly. Every scheme to suppress, and every victory which the enemies of the ancient gospel imagined they obtained against it, only furthered its progress and gave it the ascendant over its rival systems. Even the martyrdom of Stephen, the dispersion of the great congregation which was in Jerusalem, and the fierce opposition of Saul of Tarsus, for a time—all conspired to give momentum and celerity to the march of reformation.

Every effort to reform has been opposed by those whose professions ought to have placed them in the van of the preachers of righteousness. But experience has proved that those in power with the people are always afraid of revolutions. There were those at home as well as those abroad who opposed the American Revolution. Often was the contest represented as very doubtful, and sometimes thought to be almost suppressed; but, like a smothered fire, it broke out again with all conquering power. The enemies of liberty and equal rights in the old country, speaking through their representatives in Parliament, often said, "A few more ships of the line, and a regiment or two more despatched to the colonies, and the rebels are vanquished." They raised new armaments, and equipped new ships, and sung, "Down with the insurgents!" but all in vain. The rights of man triumphed, and will triumph again!

Luther's Reformation was often represented as expiring in agonies. Still it lived and progressed. The councils of the Pope and his Cardinals were held often and at short intervals. The lesser and the greater excommunications were threatened, and relied upon. But what did they avail? The "*bull*" of excommunication is issued to *gore* Luther and his friends; but what of that? The very instant the councils had done all that they could, the cause began to triumph.

Even yet the enemies of reform rely upon such measures; and because some of the reformers have suffered the greater excommunication from the hands of the general union councils *de propaganda fide*, the Luminary of the anti-reformists proclaims the speedy desolations of New Testamentism in Kentucky. A few months are allowed for the funeral obsequies, and the days of mourning for the reformers shall be ended.

But as soon will the Baptist Chronicle and its friends prevent the rising of the sun, as suppress the progress of reform in this commonwealth. There is a redeeming principle in this community which no man nor set of men can impede. Since my last visit to this country the conquests of the spirit of inquiry and research, every where apparent, and the progress of many great minds in the knowledge of the christian institution, far surpass any thing I had learned from the most flattering communications. The immense congregations which

we meet in every town and village, as well as in the country, which no inclemency of weather nor unpleasantness of the roads prevents, with the crowds of inquirers flocking to the hospitable firesides of the friends of reform, constitute one of the signs of the times here, which no perversity of mind can misinterpret.

The chain of Xerxes did as much fetter the sea, as the Franklin Decrees can restrain the inquisitiveness which is every where abroad. The minds of the Kentucky reformers have done as much homage to the Frankfort triumvirate as Mount Athos did to that vain and haughty monarch, who presumed to command it into obeisance. Some men are slow to learn, even in the school of experience, or they would ere now have learned that the human mind cannot be restrained by prohibitions, nor made to think per orders of those in power.

This volume must have some allusions to the year in which it is written, and carry with it the internal marks of the year 1831. Our Prospectus will not be lost sight of, nor the pressing topics of the day. Free discussion and a just regard to the views of those who oppose reform, shall continue to characterize our pages. But the great need of reformation, and the leading principles of that reformation of life, and restoration of the ancient order of things for which our pen has hitherto plead, shall be the burthen of this volume.

The number of our readers still continues to increase, and every week informs us of some new accessions to the cause we plead. Its advocates, public and private, have not only increased in number, but in strength, during the last year. If the full tendency of the principles we propound be not fully carried out into practice, the reason is, the obstacles thrown in our way by those who oppose us. They unjustly accuse us of the delays of which themselves are the cause.

We promise only a continuation of our efforts. We always do the best our circumstances will permit. If we do better it will be because the surrounding circumstances are improved. The cause is not ours—its converts are not ours. We are both the Lord's. To him, then, whom we have vowed to glorify, we look for success, and on him alone we rely. We cannot but speak and write the things which we know. When we have done our best, we are but unprofitable servants. But we have an able Commander on whose power and mercy we repose. We would always bear in mind that to him alone we are accountable, and that all we should wish to achieve is, that we may be good stewards of his manifold favors vouchsafed to us. Having emancipated us from the slavery of human traditions, we cannot cease to pray and labor for the emancipation of our fellow-men from a yoke which neither they nor we can wear with ease to ourselves, with advantage to man, nor with glory to him who said, "If you continue in my word, then are you my true disciples; and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

EDITOR.

Danville, Ky. November 29, 1830.

NEW ARGUMENT.

An argument to show that were there no hint nor allusion to remission of sins, as connected with immersion, in the Scriptures; it is from other considerations, and from the concessions of almost every sect in christendom, fairly to be inferred that in immersion there is remission:—

THAT all men are sinners is confessed by all who admit the truth of the christian religion. That no person to whom the gospel is preached, who is capable of hearing and believing it, can be saved with an eternal salvation, unless pardoned before death, is admitted by all Protestants. From these two propositions it is conceded that during the continuance of this life, sometime or other, remission of sins is granted to all the saved.

That which is granted and received in this life, must be granted and received at some given time; and, consequently, there is a moment before and a moment after the favor is obtained. That which is bestowed and received at any moment of time, must, for some reason which did not exist before, be bestowed and received at that moment of time: for to suppose that any thing is granted without any reason, is to make it an unreasonable grant on the part of the donor; and to suppose that the reason of an act existed before, and not at the instant in which it is done, is to suppose that an act is done without a reason; and this again would make it an unreasonable act. From which it follows, that the reason, or consideration from which remission is bestowed, must immediately precede or accompany the act of remission.

That this reason, or consideration of forgiveness, must be something done by the subject of remission, is admitted by all Protestants of every name. Some say the agent is *active*—others say he is *passive* in the doing of it; but all agree that *something* must be done: for that no person is pardoned while asleep, or in a state of mental and corporeal inactivity, is, as far as I know, universally conceded. Remission, then, is consequent upon some act of the subject. So far we reason upon the principles and concessions of at least the Protestant world.

All acts are acts of obedience or acts of disobedience; and as no person will claim remission for an act of disobedience, it must follow that the act on which remission is consequent is an act of obedience. But there can be no obedience where there is no law: for where no law is, no transgression is; and wherever there can be no transgression, there can be no obedience. If, then, the act on which remission is consequent, be an act of obedience; and if there can be no obedience where there is no command, it follows that in the gospel there must be some command through obedience to which the gospel is obeyed and remission obtained. A command concerning remission, obedience to which secures the blessing of pardon, is, then, essential to the character of the gospel.

A question here arises: Who now forgives sins? In answering this question we have the concessions of christendom—Jesus is now

the person who forgives sins. God has granted to him this power. He has exalted him a Prince and a Saviour to bestow reformation and forgiveness of sins. What *he* does, it is true, *God* does. But God having made him Lawgiver, Governor, and Judge of men, it is Jesus the Saviour, who, while on earth, had power to forgive sins, since his exaltation to universal dominion, is alone possessed of this power. He has all judgment committed to him, is ordained of God the Judge of the living and the dead, and is exalted to confer remission on those who submit to his government, as well as to punish the disobedient. Jesus is now Lord of all, placed on the throne of the Universe; angels, authorities, principalities, and powers are subjected to him. His exaltation to this supreme authority, honor, and glory, was consequent upon his humiliation unto death. Because he humbled himself, God has exalted him, and sworn, that "*to him* every knee shall bow and every tongue confess." This exaltation and coronation as Lord of all, followed upon his ascension to heaven; since which time it follows, that a new economy, or arrangement in the Universe, has commenced. No man can *now* come to God, or obtain pardon and life, but *by him*, as the way and the life. He is "the way *new* and *living*." From these scripture premises, so generally understood and regarded, it follows, that if Jesus forgives sins, and if forgiveness be consequent upon some act of obedience, that command or act upon which it is consequent, must be a command issuing from him as invested with all this authority.

These premises being all conceded to us, (and if they were not, they are all capable of unequivocal proof,) it follows that the command concerning remission must be one emanating from Jesus *as Lord*, or as having "all authority in heaven and in earth," and that the act of obedience, on which remission is consequent, is an act of obedience, or submission to that command, whatever it may be.

If Jesus as Lord must be obeyed, Jesus must issue a command as Lord, which command must be a positive one, because one recognizing his sovereign authority, and for the purpose of bringing men under *his* government. No act commanded by Moses, by John, or by any messenger, prophet, priest, or king, can constitute this act; for if emanating from them as God's servants, it could not be an act of obedience to Jesus as God's Son. *Jesus is a Son over his own house.* No moral or religious duty enjoined before the coronation of Jesus, could be an act of obedience to him as Lord. Faith as a principle of action, prayer and praise as acts of worship, were enjoined by many of God's servants before "Jesus was made Lord and Christ." None of these, then, can, as such, be an act of obedience to Jesus as Lord. Circumcision, nor sacrifice, fasting, nor penance, nor the simple act of immersion in water, as such, can be this act. If he have ordained any act which, in whole or in part, was enjoined by any of God's servants, it must be presented in a form or meaning essentially new, so as to make it an act of *obedience to him.* I need scarcely state here, that in anticipation of this his authority and exaltation in heaven, he issued an order of this import. He commanded that in

making disciples to him, they should be *immersed into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit*. Obedience to such a command, or submission to such an institution, recognizes such various considerations as to make it a *new act of obedience*, as certainly as immersing a person believing Jesus to be the Lord, into such a name, is a new thing under the sun. He prefaced this command with an assurance that all authority in heaven and in earth was given to him. But he forbade the performance of any act of this commission until after his exaltation—until he was *made* and crowned Lord of all—until he sent them power from the throne, and had received the promised lordship over the Spirit: for Jesus is "*Lord of the Spirit.*" This command, then, was *his* command as "Lord and Christ." Obedience to it is obedience to him as Lord. Now if Jesus forgives sins—if there be a time in which he forgives them—if there be a reason for forgiving them at one moment which did not exist prior to that moment—if that reason be an act of submission or obedience to him as Lord—if the subject of remission be not, at the instant of remission, a rebel—if an act of obedience to Jesus, *as Lord*, must be an act of obedience to a positive command issuing from him, and not from any servant of God—if he commanded immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in the orders for converting men to him, as a positive act of obedience to him, as having power to forgive; then it follows, that in obeying the first command of Jesus—in submitting to the first act of reformation—in being immersed by his authority into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, our former sins are blotted out, which was the point to be proved from other premises than from the express sayings of his Apostles concerning remission. If, then, there had not been a single promise of remission connected with immersion, in all the New Testament, it is fairly to be learned from the concessions of christians and from the government of Jesus and the principles thereof, that remission of sins is obtained through faith in the blood of Jesus, by immersion. This argument is submitted to those who rely upon reason rather than upon authority. EDITOR.

BISHOP R. B. SEMPLE TO ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

DEAR SIR,

MY continual engagements have heretofore prevented my accomplishing my first intention of offering some remarks on some of the leading topics on which there is so wide a difference of views between you and myself. I have little leisure, and subjects of this sort require much to do them justice. Finding, however, so many able pens employed in defence of the truths I have so long held dear, I shall content myself with saying much less than I had at first designed.

I am no controversialist as my friends can testify. Neither from the pulpit or press have I been fond of disputation. A forty years' ministry have found me almost constantly laboring to establish principles about which the leading christian sects in the United States do

not essentially differ. I have been testifying to all sorts of people, "repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," and that christians should bring forth fruits meet for repentance. I said but little upon baptism; or, however, but few labored discourses, because I thought it so plainly laid down in the Bible, or rather New Testament, as the duty of believers, that little need be said. As a Calvinist I preached clearly and distinctly free and sovereign grace in the salvation of a sinner. The mysterious doctrines of predestination and election I touched but rarely, because I saw them but rarely touched in the Scriptures. Yet as they were there, however mysterious, I believed them and preached them, and still believe them and preach them, giving them their proportional weight compared with other doctrines, such as I thought I saw in the Scriptures. Experimental and practical divinity have been my ordinary themes, and these were so because I saw that they were the ordinary themes of Christ and his Apostles, as well as Moses and the Prophets.—Nothing but an assault upon these vital principles could induce me to enter the field of controversy. I shall therefore be as concise as possible, and shall withdraw as soon as my conscience tells me I have faithfully testified to the truth.

There are a few things which I consider vital principles, on some of which, in my estimation, you are fundamentally erroneous.—The first which I shall name, is the *Scriptures of Truth*. He that has the Bible wrong, can furnish no proof of having any thing right. This is the standard of godliness. If this be deranged, every thing measured by it must be uncertain. Indeed, it is not only important to have this standard just as God designed it, but that the minds of all should be settled and at rest respecting it. Now, sir, to me it appears that your writings have denied material parts of the Scriptures, and have so altered, by your translation, the other parts, as greatly to unsettle the minds of many on this very important subject. In a sermon of yours, said to be delivered before the Redstone Association, Sept. 1816, and printed; you say, page 15, "From what has been said, it follows that there is an essential difference betwixt the Law and Gospel—*the old Testament and the New*." In a note made upon this assertion, you say, "There are not a few professors of christianity who suppose themselves under equal obligations to obey Moses, or any other Prophet, as Christ and his Apostles: nor can they see any reason why the New Testament should be preferred to the Old." And in a long note, with your usual ingenuity, you advance arguments to prove it, *i. e.* to prove that there is an essential difference betwixt the Old Testament and the New. Now against this sentiment I must beg leave to enter my most solemn protest. I aver that the Old and the New Testaments are essentially the same as to obligation, and stand in the same relation to each other and to us, as different parts of the New Testament do to each other. Some parts of the Old Testament have been declared in the New Testament as abrogated; and many others, being obviously temporary, ceased to be obligatory, because every object has been accomplished

for which they were originally given. This is also true of the New. A christian feels no more obligation to sell his property and live on common stock with others, than he does to go through the ceremonies of the Levitical law. He feels no compunction of conscience in not obeying either, because he considers both as inapplicable to his day. The whole Bible is a precious temporary gift of Heaven, afforded us by the Father of Lights, as a lamp to guide our feet through this dark world, and will be laid aside when we arrive at the world of perfect day. Parts of it are more limited as to their duration, and applicable only to particular seasons and places. It is to my mind worse than wanton to endeavor to invalidate the unquoted parts of the Old Testament, (and which are much the larger proportion,) because others have accomplished their day. In this way we might destroy the whole Scriptures. It is not sound reasoning to say a divine law is not obligatory because not re-enacted. This may be true, as you say, as to the old British laws in Virginia, because in this case there is a new government and new governors; but not so as to God's laws towards his people. There is but one Lawgiver, and all his laws remain in force until repealed or until the accomplishment of their purpose. I would ask you, what authority has any man to assert that any part of Holy Writ has ceased to be obligatory unless Holy Writ itself declares it? And what part of the New Testament has declared that the whole of the Old is abrogated, except those texts that are quoted into the New? The *onus probandi* here lies with you. The quotations from the Old into the New are plainly made not for re-enactment, but to establish the points advanced by the New Testament writers. I take up this subject because it is a vital principle, and was not only advanced by you fourteen years ago, but has been since defended by you in your *Christian Baptist*. If, however, any change has taken place in your views, I would gladly retract what is here said.

In regard to your new translation of the New Testament, I am not prepared to say it is unlawful for any man to attempt a translation of all or any part of the Scriptures. It may be lawful, but it seems to me to be very inexpedient; that is, if it be offered as a substitute for the Old. If one does it, another may; and of course the whole christian world may be unsettled as to what is the word of God. Except Catholics and Unitarians, (I think,) all christians of all denominations have adopted and are satisfied with the old translation. They believe that if it has faults, they are not material ones; and that at best, it is very hazardous to trust any set of men in the present day to amend it. Moreover, God has owned and blessed the old translation for centuries past, to all the purposes of Scriptures. I feel, therefore, greatly averse to any substitute. I have no wish to derogate from your translation. It is certainly the production of very learned men, and has its merits. But it seems to me to be more calculated to do good when found among the writings of its authors, than when embodied in a volume, and called a New Testament. Respectfully yours,

RO. B. SEMPLE.

A. CAMPBELL'S REPLY TO BRO. B. SEMPLE.

DANVILLE, Ky. November 29, 1830.

BROTHER SEMPLE,

Dear Sir—MY Clerk has forwarded to me a copy of your letter of October 30, to this place. I am always glad to hear from you, and so are many of my readers. Many in this commonwealth venerate you highly, and are anxious to see what you have to offer for, or against, any topic now in discussion. Few, indeed, expect any change in your views, although many of your friends wish it. Old men are said to be timid and prudent, while the young are generally bold and enterprizing. As the mind descends the hill of life, early associations rise in their influences, and become stronger as the vigor of the constitution abates. Hence the difficulty of converting the aged. When Hervey discovered the true principles of the circulation of the blood, it is said, that while the young physicians, almost to a man, received his demonstrations and arguments, no man above forty years of age acknowledged his reasonings to be conclusive. When Bacon, the author of the inductive philosophy, developed the science which revolutionized all the colleges in Protestant christendom, few of the old teachers could endure it. But in one generation the literary and medical worlds were regenerated by these two men. The old men died, and the young were all converted.

The principles of the reformation are, however, received by some very old men, and by many who are above forty; yet but few men of high standing and of advanced years have ever been reformers Their friends dare not approach them, and their opponents are not to be regarded. They are placed in very unfavorable circumstances, as respects conviction. But still their attempts to sustain their views are very useful to the community. The foundations of their views and systems of instruction, when laid open to the discerning, afford them either conviction or confirmation. The authority of their opinions is then correctly estimated, because the reason of them is subjected to examination. On this account, as well as for my personal regard for you, I am always glad to receive any thing from you for publication. The letter before me is an interesting one, because it contains your "*testimony* to the truth" of your opinions on some of the principal topics of "your ministry."

The *historical* part of your communication before me, detailing the *doctrines* you have been teaching, is first worthy to be noticed. The Apostles testified to "*Jews and Greeks*" repentance, or reformation, towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. This you have done, you say, to *all sorts* of people. No doubt you have found it necessary to testify the same things to Christians which Paul did to Jews and Greeks; for our modern christians need both reformation towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. The reformation of christians, then, you confess to be necessary; and that even in faith, and in the doctrine of repentance.

You said "little about baptism," because so plainly laid down in the

Bible; and much about the things not plainly laid down in the book. If the plainness of baptism was a good reason for seldom preaching it, it applies equally to repentance and faith if they be plainly laid down in the book. But the "*mysterious*" doctrines of predestination and election you "rarely touched," because "rarely touched in the book." If, then, you seldom preached baptism because plainly taught, and seldom preached election and reprobation because seldom touched, I am at a loss to understand why you so much insisted upon other matters, as neither the plainness nor obscurity of such things could be a reason, in your judgment, for touching them. The things which you taught, must, in your judgment, have been neither plain nor obscure in the book. These reasons for your ministrations place the great topics of your life in a singular attitude before my mind.

Another hint in your favor before me arrests my attention. You say that you have been for almost forty years "laboring to *establish* principles about which the leading christian sects in the United States do not essentially differ." Why you should labor to *establish* principles already established in the minds of the leading sects, is to me inexplicable. Is not this to represent established principles as not established; and does it not present the labors of forty years in a very inexplicable character to the reflecting mind?

But "as a Calvinist" you felt yourself under the necessity of choosing this course: for you observe that, "as a Calvinist, you preach clearly and distinctly free and sovereign grace." Now had this been as plainly taught as baptism, or as obscurely taught as election and predestination, your reason would not have permitted you to have made this topic the burthen of your ministry.

As to a *grace*, called free and sovereign, I have only to say, that I know of no grace that is not *free* and *sovereign*. There can be no grace unless it flow from *the will* of a sovereign; and if it be not *free* as respects him from whom it flows, it is involuntary. But if you mean that it is free to all mankind, then all mankind are embraced in it; and if *sovereign* mean with you *discriminating*, then to call grace both sovereign and free, is to say that it is, and it is not, grace. But this only by the way.

"Experimental divinity" has been your theme, of which divinity neither baptism nor election are, in your judgment, constituents. The Apostles, then, were accustomed to say much and to write much concerning a divinity which was neither practical nor experimental. Baptism is, however, in every sermon, and election in every epistle.

Without preaching *water*, none of the first preachers could preach Jesus: for not to mention the discourses in which it is named, I shall only remind you of the hint of Luke in his account of the preaching of Philip. He tells us in the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, that Philip preached Jesus to the Eunuch. He tells us not a word of the sermon. He only says, beginning at a certain passage in Isaiah, "he proclaimed to him Jesus." The Eunuch first mentioned water, according to the details of this incident. Now the question is, Why

should the Eunuch have said, "*Here is water*," if Philip, in preaching Jesus, had not named immersion? The inference is inevitable, (if we had neither command nor precedent, of which, however, there is no lack,) that in preaching Jesus, they always preached water. The reason is, a gospel without remission of sins is a misnomer; and no person, in those undegenerate days, could preach remission without naming water. I agree with you that scholastic, speculative, and polemic theology, are unworthy of the preaching of a reformer of men. I am for principles of action. Therefore I proclaim faith, reformation, immersion, adoption, and eternal life.

I now proceed to the argumentative part of your letter. And here, brother Semple, I could have wished that you had been still more logical and argumentative. I am pleased to see that you go so far back as the year 1816, and commence with my most juvenile essay in a Sermon on the Law. The sentiment which in this sermon you have the goodness to assail, is, that there is an essential difference between the Old Testament and the New; that we are not under the same obligation to obey Moses as Jesus and his Apostles. These are the principles you assail. I affirm and you deny. But you are pleased not to assail my arguments in proof of the affirmative, but to convert your negation into an affirmative position, and then to prove your own proposition. This is magnanimous and creditable to you as a candid man. You enter your protest against my affirming that there is an essential difference between the Old Testament and the New, and proceed to affirm that "*the Old Testament and the New are the same as to obligation.*" In support of this position, in which you put upon yourself the *onus probandi*, or the burthen of proof, by affirming instead of attempting to refute my arguments in the said sermon. You proceed to reason; but, to my utter astonishment, you call upon no witness, and offer not one argument. You call not upon any Prophet or Apostle for a single saying, and neither quote Moses nor the Messiah in support of your affirmation. I am sorry, brother Semple, to see you take this course, because of the weight of your example; it looks so like (though I am far from imputing to you such a thought) placing your *name* against mine—an example which your experience cannot approve. You know the weight of your name and years is against me; but how often have both name and years been paraded against the truth. These *ex cathedra* arguments, these *argumenta ad modestiam*, as logicians call them, are, you must confess, *papistical*. To make an appeal to my modesty, or an argument from authority, the proof of an affirmative proposition, is not in unison with the spirit of this age. To support any position as we support a favorite candidate at the polls, by giving our vote, is not the present order of the day. For in these Republics one vote counts as much as another, notwithstanding the disparity in the standing of the voters.

In support of your "solemn protest" and affirmative position you offer a few other solemn protests and affirmative propositions. But these all need proof. I will notice them in due form:—You assert that "the Old and New Testaments stand in the same relation to each

other and to us, as different parts of the New Testament do to each other." Why not have added, "*and to us?*" This faltering in the conclusion argues distrust in the premises. But this is not that at which I most demur. I must do more than offer my solemn protest against what follows:—"Some parts of the Old Testament have been declared in the New Testament as abrogated." "This is also true of the New Testament," &c. Is it possible, brother Semple, that you teach that some parts of the New Testament are abrogated!! What are your specifications? Here they come; but all are condensed into a unit:—"A christian feels no more obligation to sell his property and live in common stock with others, than he does to go through the ceremonies of the Levitical law. He feels no compunction of conscience in not obeying either, because he considers both as inapplicable to his day." This is your proof Now, my good sir, before you talk of *obeying* you ought to state the *command:* for where there is no command there can be no obedience; and before you talk of abrogating any law in the New Testament, you ought to show that it was once a law of the New Testament, like the Levitical law, for obliging christians to live in common stock. I need not inform you that the word "abrogation" applies only to law, and the word "obedience" to a command: and if there be neither command nor law on this subject, there can be no abrogation. But is this true of the Levitical ceremonies? Had they no law nor command? Does the "common stock" of which you speak, and the Levitical economy, stand upon the same footing? If not, there is no more analogy between these matters than between Noah's leaving the ark upon Mount Ararat, and Paul's leaving his cloak in Troas.

The difference between a "common stock" church, and a common participation of goods as every one had need, is immense. The idea of a common stock for creating either wealth or the means of subsistence, is an idea essentially different from that of a common distribution of joint or particular donations according to the wants of the brotherhood. Now to suppose that an example of this sort in the case of the Jerusalem congregation, is done away, is not only inexplicable upon the received meaning of examples, (for examples can never be abrogated,) but it is teaching, however unintentionally on your part, that the example of liberality afforded by these disciples is an unsafe one, and that it is as unworthy of imitation in any circumstance, and as inobligatory as the Levitical law, priesthood, or services. But to return.

In your zeal, brother Semple, to place Moses in the same chair with Christ and his Apostles, and to bring us "*under the law*," instead of placing us under Christ, do you not seem to yourself to render the New Testament as useless to Christians as the Catholics have rendered both the Old and the New? Do you not fear to teach that some parts of the law of Christ, as well as some parts of the law of Moses, are abolished? Does the Old Testament stand in the same relation to the New and to us as the first Epistle of Peter does to the second and to us? If I misunderstand you, it will give me pleasure to be correct-

ed by you; but, as your words obviously to me import, you teach that we are under the same obligation to Moses, Samuel, and Nehemiah, as we are to Paul, Peter, and John.

Now that you may understand me—I teach, that the writings of Moses and the Prophets contain not only much useful history and prophecy, but also many communications from God to men of immense importance to us Christians; and, as my debate with Mr. Owen proves, no man values them more than I. But to teach that we must feel ourselves equally under obligation to obey Moses, a servant in another person's family, as we do to obey Christ, a Son over his own family, which family is the whole christian assembly, I cannot. And believe me, that I know of few Episcopalians or Presbyterians who have gone so far to judaize, as you have done in this letter. The very question which the Apostles and Elders and the brethren of the Jews by the Holy Spirit decided in Jerusalem, you seem to have again revived.

You will have us Gentile Christians to be as much obliged to obey Moses as Christ—as much under the law as under favor—as much under all the Prophets as under the Great Prophet, of whom Moses in the law and all the Prophets did write. Although Jesus said, "The law and the Prophets were instructers till John; but since that time the kingdom of God is announced, and all men press into it;" although both Moses the lawgiver, and Elias the law-reformer, came down from heaven and laid their commission at the feet of Jesus, and the Father then spoke from the magnificent glory, commanding men to obey his Son; although the Apostles reasoned and remonstrated against the judaizers, telling the people to keep the law as obligatory upon them as the gospel of Jesus; and compared the law to Hagar, and them under its obligation to Ishmael; although the Holy Spirit says we are delivered from the law, and that we are under the New Testament, and not under the Old, which now has become, as a rule of life, obsolete and is done away; yet you solemnly protest against the declaration that there is an essential difference between the Old Testament and the New as respects obligation on Christians; and will attempt to prove that we are under the same obligation to obey Moses in every thing not formally excepted in the New, *because Moses commanded it.* If this be not to dash upon a real rock, while avoiding an imaginary shoal, will you have the goodness to instance it in any thing else?

After failing to sustain your own position which you had affirmed, you make an affirmative for me, and throw the *onus probandi* upon me. I do not, however, exactly approve of the proposition you have made for me, and will merely say in reply, that Jesus, and all the Apostles who have alluded to this subject, plainly and unequivocally teach that the law of Moses is not the rule of life for Christians, in whole nor in part; but that *Jesus* is our Lord, Lawgiver, Prophet, Priest, and King; and that if we renounce him as a Prophet, we may as well take Aaron for our Priest, Moses for our Lawgiver, and David for our King.

This subject you please to say is of *vital* importance. I am glad you form so high an opinion of it, and hope you will attend to what I have to offer upon it. As my sheet is full, and I have to despatch per mail, you will please excuse me for postponing the remainder of my answer till the next.

In all the charities, yours,

EDITOR.

LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

LETTER III.

Sir—

IT is not presumed that all who write or speak in the behalf of Christianity, believe it to be of divine authenticity and authority; neither can it be presumed that all who speak or write against it, believe it to be a human contrivance. You, sir, appear to be one of this class. You appear to be willing to disbelieve it, and to sustain yourself before the tribunal of your own conscience in rejecting it. But to one who looks narrowly into the pamphlet you have written in the character of a "*Private Student*," it appears that, though anxious to disprove the resurrection of Jesus, the author has strong misgivings in his own reasonings; and while asserting, in strong terms, his disbelief of that fact, cannot persuade himself that it is not true. The lurking suspicion that truth is on the side you oppose, is to me very manifest from the whole drift and tenor of your objections and reasonings. If you do not distrust your own conclusions, you have done injustice to yourself.

You would have the reader to think that you have replied to one argument in my debate with Mr. Owen, viz. that drawn from the certainty of the resurrection of Jesus. You would have him to suppose that you have attended to the evidences adduced in support of that fact. But this is very far from the truth. You have not once stated the whole argument. Some branches of it you have glanced at, but not with any reference to the connexion in which they stand. As a whole, the argument is not once noticed.

You would have the reader to believe that a caucus was held the night after the reported resurrection, and agreed by all the disciples assembled that they would report that Jesus had risen, well knowing at the same time that Nicodemus and Joseph had stolen the body, in order to cheat the nation into the belief that he was alive. This you make them do for no assignable reason worthy of a child; and although you represent them at one time machinating the cheat, artfully designing and slyly propagating it, you bring them forward in the narratives written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as full of gross and palpable contradictions, rendering their testimony incredible to any "*rational*" man, because of the want of *concert* in their manner of relating the circumstances of the resurrection. This is

the pith and fatness of your *rational* objections to the resurrection of Jesus. The original witnesses *concerted* to cheat the world, and to spend their lives in propagating it, and finally to die for the sake of cheating the world, and to tell the story with such glaring contradictions as no reasonable man could believe it. Thus you explain the phenomena of christianity. This is with you reason pure and unsophisticated. The miracle which passes with you as a reasonable and credible miracle is this:—Ten or twelve men, of no education, and of the humblest pretensions as to genius, and consequently the freest from *ambition, the characteristic and accompaniment of genius*, concerted, after the Jews killed their master, to propagate the belief that he rose from the dead, so soon as they heard the body was missing; and purely for the sake of imposture agreed to sacrifice every thing, life itself, and all future hope of reward, for the noble design of imposing an unprofitable lie upon the world, and yet had not sense enough to tell a feasible story about it. This is your reasonable faith, and that which you oppose to the unreasonable faith of all christians of all ages.

Whether your professed faith in this weak and wicked collusion be true or genuine, must be proved like all other professions—*by your works*. Think not, sir, when I name your *works*, that I have any idea of giving them in evidence of the sincerity of your faith in your own reasonings about the cheat of the resurrection. I shall only say, in passing, that I could wish that all who profess to believe that Jesus rose from the dead and will judge the world, might honor their profession by a walk so consistent as that by which you honor your profession. If their faith had wrought so fully in their works as your faith has wrought in your works, there would have been still fewer readers of your book than there are. But the sincerity of your faith is by this book rendered as dubious to me, as your paralytic attacks have made it doubtful to yourself.

To see an old man, tottering on the brink of the grave, so impotent in reason and so strong in hate, so imbecile in argument and so violent in opposition, ridiculing and blaspheming that Judge of All and his scheme of benevolence, before whom he is soon to appear—is a spectacle of the moral sublime, so terrific and appalling, that my soul turns from the scene and revolts at the sight, while my promise to notice your effort recalls me to the examination of your objections. Pardon the digressions which these feelings may occasion.

On page 12th you say that the twelve Apostles are not witnesses of the resurrection; or, what is the same thing, that "*only two of them* have left their testimony." You mean that only *two* of them have written memoirs of Jesus Christ. And is it possible that a gentleman of your pretensions to reason, and to discriminate evidence, regards that only as testimony which appears in the form of memoirs! Has Peter left no testimony behind him because he wrote no memoirs of Jesus Christ? Has James, has Jude, has none of the Apostles save Matthew and John, testified to the fact of Jesus' resurrection? Is

there no testimony left behind a man if it be not in writing from his own pen? Are not the labors, preachings, punishments, and deaths of the other Apostles in asserting what they saw and heard, a testimony to the resurrection of Jesus? Are not all the labors and trials of all the original disciples as strong a proof of the resurrection of Jesus, as unambiguous testimony to it, as the written narratives of Matthew and John? Is not Peter's death, are not Peter's two epistles, are not the three thousand Pentecostian converts, who saw and heard the proofs of the Messiah's resurrection, and who changed their course of life on that account, as strong testimony as a written narrative? Is not the martyrdom of Stephen, and the conversion of Saul, as valid as the writings of Matthew and John? Was not every convert made by the proclamation of the original witnesses, whose testimony was confirmed by all the signs and wonders recorded, valid testimony to the fact alleged? Is there no other proof, or will there in a few years be no other proof of the American Revolution, save the two or three histories of it written by those who lived contemporaneously with the progress and issue of that struggle? A word on this subject from you might elicit a fuller exposition of the fallacy by which you would willingly impose upon yourself.

But you say that no testimony can prove the resurrection of Jesus, because the thing is itself *incredible*. "The resurrection of a dead man," you call (page 15) "an unnatural, irrational, incredible, and impossible fact." Therefore to you it is impossible to be proved by any testimony. Why, then, quarrel with the testimony when the fact is to your mind impossible, irrational, and unnatural! Yet you profess to be a *Deist*—one who believes that there is one Omnipotent Creator—one who believes in the unnatural, irrational, and impossible fact of giving birth to the first man without a mother! The greatest miracle in the Bible you believe upon the mere testimony of your senses, exercised upon the things which are seen! That the cold and inanimate earth, in her virgin state, brought forth a rational and sentient being, you believe. for in this pamphlet you boast that you are a Deist or Theist! If, then, it was not unnatural, irrational, nor impossible for the cold and inanimate earth, in a virgin state, to bring forth a son, yourself being judge, with what pretension to reason can you say that it is irrational, unnatural, and impossible for the married earth to bring forth what has been committed to her; or that God cannot raise from the dust a dead man, when he raised a living race out of inanimate dust, as you believe? On this you will please ponder till next you hear from your friend,

THE EDITOR.

Near Glasgow, Ky. December 3, 1830.

P. S. I write this not having my former letters to you before me, and without a copy of my Debate, or an opportunity of examining your pamphlet since I left home.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

NO. II.

FIRST day of the week, October 31, having no society with which to unite in social worship, we went on our journey. We read and conversed alternately. The first twenty chapters of Matthew's Testimony furnished us with topics for the day. At Circleville and Washington was written the first number of this series. November 3d we arrived in Wilmington, Clinton county, and were cordially received by the disciples of Christ in that place. We were refreshed in spirit by the brethren in Wilmington. Here we met with brothers Samuel Rogers, Aylett Rains, and Arthur Grifield, who labor in the word and teaching in this county. The apostolic gospel has been proclaimed with great effect by these brethren in this region. There are some others in this county whom we did not see, who co-operate with them in the work of reformation. Brother Rains, aided by these brethren, has performed a great and good work in this county and in a corner of the neighboring county of Highland. Since May last, by their instrumentality, 197 persons have obeyed the gospel. Besides, the whole Regular Baptist church in Wilmington, one female excepted, has embraced the ancient gospel; and now, with many new converts, are endeavoring to walk in the apostolic institutions. The inquiry among these disciples now is, *What has the Lord commanded?* not, What do the Regular Baptists say? or, What does the Philadelphia Confession of Faith dictate? but what say the Scriptures?

Several churches in Clinton county now meet every Lord's day to celebrate the death and resurrection of Jesus. Antioch, by the labors of brother Samuel Rogers, was the first congregation in these regions that met on the Lord's day to keep the ordinances. *Eleven* disciples only, if I mistake not, associated some two or three years ago for this purpose, called the Congregation of Antioch. Besides those who have removed thence, this congregation now amounts to about *seventy-five* persons; the congregation in Wilmington now enumerates *eighty* members; that on Cowan's Creek, about *fifty*. The number of disciples at Anderson's Fork I could not ascertain. In Jamestown, Highland county, there is a congregation of thirty-nine, which, like those already mentioned, meet every first day of the week to break the loaf. Besides these congregations who statedly meet together in one place, others are likely soon to be formed of disciples living too far off for weekly meetings.

The disciples of Christ seem very generally to be aware that no persons should belong to any particular congregation who cannot conveniently meet with their brethren every Lord's day; and that the fact of being able to attend every Lord's day with the brethren, is the rule which decides to what congregation they should belong. Therefore, when it happens that some half dozen of disciples live too far off from the place of meeting of any particular church, they find it expedient to meet by themselves for the christian worship on the Lord's day. Several small societies diffuse more light than one large one; many fires kindled in a camp diffuse more light and heat than one or

two large fires remote from each other, and inaccessible to many of the army. These small beginnings, scattered over a district of country, tend to give a larger increase of disciples annually than if the same number which meet weekly, in three or four places, met irregularly in one place. The simplicity, humility, and brotherly kindness which appear in these small assemblies, and the more rapid progress which the disciples make in christian knowledge, faith, and love, from more of them being called upon to take a part in the christian worship, are greater auxiliaries to the spread of the gospel, more powerful arguments for the truth, and recommendations of the excellency of the christian institution, than an immense pile of stone, brick, or wood, with the ornaments of architecture, called a church or meeting house, filled with an assembly of carnal worshippers, in all the pomp and pageantry of the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, waiting upon a Parson, all of whom, save one consecrated tongue, are dumb in the christian worship.

We do not say that large congregations, which can conveniently meet in one place, should fracture themselves up into a number of small ones, specially for this purpose: for the circumstance of their being able conveniently to meet in one place, proves that it would be unnecessary to meet in sundry places; for all who could witness their order and worship in sundry places could witness it in one place, on the supposition that they can conveniently assemble in one place every Lord's day. The disobedient who live among the disciples, if disposed to visit their meetings, can always as conveniently attend where the disciples meet as the disciples themselves. The conversion of the disobedient, as well as the growth of the disciples in knowledge, faith, love, and hope, is not to be lost sight of in the assemblies of the saints. Experience moreover proves that it is conducive to the good of the brotherhood, as well as to the conversion of those without, that occasionally the churches in contiguous districts should meet in one place; and also that even two or three disciples who cannot find any others with whom to associate, should not, on that account, forsake the institutions of christian worship. But, indeed, it does appear that in Rome, as well as in Jerusalem, in the apostolic age, while the great congregation of the disciples in those cities frequently convened in one place, there were small societies in the houses of different brethren, perhaps in the suburbs, or remote from the place of general rendezvous, which were known as the congregation in the house of Priscilla and Aquila; the brethren who meet with Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, and Hermes. Rom. xvi. These were addressed in a letter to the congregation of disciples in Rome, and yet distinguished by the Apostles as meeting in different places in that immense metropolis. It appears to have been so in Jerusalem. The congregation in Rome which met in the house of Priscilla and Aquila is again mentioned by Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians. The church in Cesar's family is also mentioned in the letter to the Philippians, and that in the house of Nymphas in the letter to the Colossians.

But to return to Wilmington. On Thursday, the 4th November, we

had a public discourse. A considerable audience, on a few hours notice, convened from the town and country, about half of which were disciples. We addressed them from Peter's discourse in Solomon's Portico. Among other positions illustrated and confirmed by the apostolic testimony, the following were conspicuous:—

1. That as mankind, however diversified in other respects, were all, as respects the gospel, distributed into two classes—*the obedient and the disobedient*—there could, in the nature of things, be but two modes of address, called in the New Testament *preaching* and and *teaching*.

2. That in *preaching* there must be one topic in every address, as the all-engrossing topic; and that this topic is reformation. In attestation of which the commission of John the Immerser, of the Saviour as a Prophet, of the *Twelve*, and the *Seventy* were adduced.

3. That as reformation was a very general and comprehensive theme, and had reference to more objects than one, various motives and arguments were appended to every proclamation of reformation in accordance with the specific character of the reformation preached. Thus in *the reformation* proclaimed by John, by Jesus, by the Seventy, and by the Twelve, in their *first* commission, the great argument was, FOR THE REIGN OF HEAVEN WAS SOON TO COMMENCE. In the *second* commission, given after the resurrection of Jesus, the arguments were *three*—

1st. That your sins may be blotted out.

2d. That seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come upon you.

3d. That he may send Jesus Christ for your *eternal* salvation.

4. That it is the *immediate* duty of those addressed in this proclamation to obey the gospel, or to reform, and turn to God.

At the close of the discourse one young man of respectable attainments came forward and obeyed the gospel. He was immersed for the remission of his sins by brother Samuel Rogers.

We arrived in Cincinnati on the evening of the 5th November, and were very cordially received by the brethren and friends. The church in this city which meets every first day of the week to break the loaf, is advancing in the knowledge of the Christian Scriptures, and is acquiring more boldness in the faith. All the sects seem to view this congregation with great jealousy. It is subjected to the most rigid scrutiny and uncharitable criticism by all its sectarian neighbors. The ancient gospel and order of things are odious in the eyes of the priesthood; for in their progress and advancement they foresee the prostration of their assumptions. Those who wish to walk in the customs and traditions of their fathers, right or wrong, unite in opposing all reformations, and especially the believers of the apostolic gospel. Hence the brethren in Cincinnati are much opposed by the sectaries, and by none more than by the Calvinian Baptists. As the unbelieving Jews were in all places the most implacable persecutors of the Apostles and their preaching, so these regular followers of Gill and Fuller are exceedingly fierce against all who presume to depart

from their paternal customs. With them the preachers of the ancient gospel are worse than infidels, or treated as such. Before I had arrived in Cincinnati, my friend Sedwick of Zanesville, had, it was reported, written on to a deacon, (not of *the church*, but of *the priesthood*,) that I was "the most refined infidel he had ever seen." This deacon is strongly suspicioned to be the author of some slanderous letters which have appeared in the Chronicle and Columbian Star, and is conspicuous for no virtue so much, as for having been the troubler of many churches. Every man who denies the divine right of the priesthood to mysticise, and to teach the *hidden meaning* of the Scriptures, is an infidel. My infidelity in Zanesville consisted in proving that the New Testament is an intelligible book. Had I informed my audience that the book was unintelligible, and that Mr. Sedwick had got from heaven, by immediate revelation, a key of interpretation; and that he was called and sent to expound the book for a certain *per annum*, I would have been, in his eyes, a christian.

On the Lord's day morning we addressed a very large concourse, from the 15th chapter of 1st Samuel, and the 2d chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. This discourse was addressed to the *disobedient*. It was demonstrated that a partial obedience, accompanied with a wilful neglect or disobedience of any part of a divine message, was equivalent to a total rejection of the message, and compared by Samuel to idolatry, iniquity, and divination.

In the afternoon the *obedient* were addressed from Col. iii. The high calling from above, the christian adoption, and "the things which are above," were the topics. After the address the disciples celebrated the Lord's Supper. This congregation consists of from two to three hundred disciples. There are many very intelligent and zealous brethren in it, who are qualified to preside in a christian meeting, and are acquiring much boldness in the faith. Brother Challin labors in the word and teaching with good effect, and his heart is in the work. It is hoped that the disciples composing this congregation will ere long be so able to edify one another, as to employ brother Challin to labor in the proclamation of the gospel for the conversion of those without.

In the evening we continued our discourse, unfinished in the morning, from the same topics. Before we left the city we had the pleasure of immersing for remission four persons, two males and two females.

On Monday, the 8th November, we visited a church in the country, about 9 miles from Cincinnati, on Mill Creek, Ohio, and delivered them a lecture on the 4th chapter of the 1st Epistle of John. *The Spirit of Antichrist* was shown to be a mystic spirit. The *tests* by which every spirit was to be tried were examined, and submission to the Apostles' doctrine proved to be the criterion of a christian church.

On the same evening, in Covington, Kentucky, we spoke to a congregation on sin and its cure. In this place there is a church decidedly for reform. The Old Baptists have generally rallied around the New Testament, and renounced human creeds as rules of christian faith and practice.

On Tuesday morning returned to Cincinnati, and spent the day in conversation and business. This city is very religious in building meeting houses. The Presbyterians are more devout than any other sect; for they build houses for which they have no congregations. Like the prudent German, who builds his barn before his harvest is reaped, they build meeting houses before they thrust a sickle into the field. They go upon the presumption that God has decreed to have many Presbyterian churches in this flourishing city. But they anticipate the Lord.

Mr. Root's church is a very splendid and fashionable edifice; a worldly holy place. It cost about 23,000 dollars. Its celestial steeple is devoutly lofty and expensive. It ascends towards heaven high as the aspirations of its humble inhabitants. It is said that it only cost 8,000 dollars. How much better is this sum laid up in brick and mortar than spent in missionary projects!! The pious residents preferred the steeple to six hundred three score and six souls, which is just the price of it. For at twelve dollars per month for missionary labor, averaging one soul per month, as the fruit of that sort of labor, the brick and mortar in the battlement of this temple cost the amount of the apocalyptic beast. The number of his name is 666, the quotient of 8000 divided by 12. But, perhaps, it was expected that *looking* upon this steeple would be the means of converting as many souls as 666 missionary months labor. At all events, it is a sure index of the pulse of missionary piety. The moral health of the missionary spirit is quite apparent from this religious appropriation of the means of salvation. Well may the last mite be solicited from the widow to send a missionary from Cincinnati to the isles afar off when the funds at home are so abundant as to build brick satyres upon his religion whose best followers met in garrets to extol their Lord and King.

This holy place, said to have been founded upon the Rock by him who laid its corner stone, is only half as sacred as Dr. Wilson's church, for it has *two* horns upon its altar, or two steeples—the one for the Jews and the other for the Gentiles. These are not quite so magnificent as Mr. Root's cupola; but two arguments are more convincing than one; and he that would be only convicted by looking upon one spire, will surely be converted by gazing upon two, on one church. The plain, unassuming Presbyterian, will be apt to ask if *eight* churches, worth 1000 dollars each, would not be more useful to the community than one steeple; but this is owing to his ignorance: for one splendid bait will be more likely to allure a high-minded citizen to orthodoxy than twenty plain buildings. At least so determined the founders of St. Peter's church in Rome, and no good reason can be shown why this sprightly daughter should not appear as genteel as the Madame herself.

Churches are building in this city upon the same principle as bridges and turnpikes. The stock is taken by capitalists, and the pew rents are relied upon to afford a dividend equal to bank stock. The rich are now to have the gospel preached to them in houses owned

by the rulers of the darkness of this world. Satan, it may be expected, will soon reform, seeing he now builds meeting houses for the proclamation of the gospel. In Paul's time he assumed to be an angel of light; but now he is a preacher of righteousness, and a liberal contributor to the spread of that gospel which he conscientiously approves. *O Tempora! O Mores!* EDITOR.

Harrodsburg, Ky. November 25, 1830.

NOTES ON A TOUR, &c.—No. III.

BROTHER *Parmley* having, from indisposition, preferred to descend the Ohio in a steam-boat, rather than to risk a journey by land through Kentucky, brother *Ephraim A. Smith*, of Danville, Ky. having met me at Cincinnati, became my fellow traveller, and on the 9th of November we departed from Cincinnati to Cynthiana, Harrison county, Ky. On the 11th of the month we arrived in that place; found a large congregation in waiting, and addressed them from Hebrews i. on God's last message by his Son. We spent the evening at the house of brother *John Chinn*, Sen. about 8 miles distant. The next day I delivered a discourse to a large assembly on the 1st chapter of the 2d letter to the Thessalonians, met in the town of Leesburg. The burthen of this discourse was—

1. *That in the gospel there must be a command, else it could not be obeyed: for where there is no command there can be no obedience.*
2. The obedience of law and the obedience of faith contrasted.
3. The command in the gospel, obedience to which is styled obeying the gospel.
4. The destiny of those who do not obey the gospel.

From Leesburg we proceeded to Georgetown, and arrived on the evening of the 13th at the house of brother *Rhodes Thompson*. On Lord's day addressed a large assembly convened in the Methodist meeting house. The other meeting houses in town were offered, both Christian and Baptist. This was thankfully received because the largest in town.

The topics here were faith, reformation, and remission of sins. Various portions of the apostolic writings were examined, specially the sermon on Pentecost, and in Solomon's Portico, pronounced by Peter. This being the head-quarters of the opposition, the seat of the new college and of the chronicler of the movements of the rulers of the darkness of this world, the caricature historian of the events of the crisis, I aimed at great perspicuity in all the developements of the day. But none are so blind as those who will not see, nor so deaf as those who will not hear. Hence I am represented in the next Chronicle as saying that nothing could be more absurd than to exhort a person to repent or be sorry for sin, or in words to that effect, as I have not the Chronicle before me; I am, however, always misrepresented in that paper; and as the editor fights not with the weapons of our warfare, we must apply to him the moral of a tale about barking dogs, which, if I mistake not, sometime since appeared in his own paper. We will not now throw him a bone nor a stone.

The idea which I expressed, a perversion of which I have just mentioned, was this:—As the thousands who interrogated Peter on Pentecost had bitterly repented of what they had done, and were pierced to the heart with sorrow and anguish, it would have been every way unreasonable to have commanded them to be sorry for their sins, or to repent, in the vulgar sense of that term. The Apostle, therefore, said, *Reform* and be immersed. If I mistake not, I alluded here to what is usually called legal and evangelical repentance, and concluded that what was commonly designated "evangelical repentance," was the idea attached to the term *reform*. It was such a regret for the past—such a change of views as terminated in a change of life. This I say not for the benefit of Mr. Chambers; for he knows as well as he knows any dogma of Calvinism, that such are my views; but as he is the pen and ink for the coalition against reform, he must publish such palpable absurdities. I only request the inquisitive to read for themselves what I have written, and take not such perversions for my sentiments, if they feel any interest in understanding the points at issue. After the discourse two persons came forward and obeyed the gospel. I immersed them into the one faith in a stream contiguous to the town.

We spent the evening with brother B. Chambers, an intelligent and zealous advocate of the ancient gospel, a brother of the editor of the Chronicle. We had much conversation with a number of disciples and inquirers, among whom was my old friend John Brice, Esq formerly of Fredericksburg, Va. He *preaches* religion, as he was wont in Virginia, and *practises* law. He hopes to persevere to the end in the good old Baptist doctrines of the good old Virginia school, upon the supposition, no doubt, that the doctrines and practices of the Virginia Baptists are purely scriptural and apostolic.

I omitted to state, that in the vicinity of Leesburg there is a church recently convened, under the oversight of brother Dr. *Chinn*, which meets every Lord's day to keep the ordinances.

From Georgetown, on Monday morning, we proceeded to the Crossings meeting house, where we found a considerable congregation at half past 9 o'clock. It being court day, and a number of lawyers attending, we got through with our discourse at 11 o'clock. The topic was the 2d chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

The connexion between purity and happiness, and the reward of *eternal life* proposed to them, who, by patient continuance in well doing, are seeking for glory, honor, and immortality, was the burthen of this discourse. I was sorry that my engagements to proceed to Frankfort obliged me to decline a very pressing invitation from Col. *Richard M. Johnson*, author of the Sunday Mail Report, to deliver an address at his house that evening. Overtaken with rain, and prevented from reaching Frankfort, we spent the evening very agreeably with a company of disciples, enjoying the hospitalities of brother Holloway, 8 miles from the metropolis of Kentucky.

Next morning, being the 16th of November, we proceeded to the seat of government. This was the theatre on which Col. Sharp was

assassinated by Beauchamp, and from which the *thirty-nine articles* of the Franklin Decrees were issued. We found the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches locked up, and St. Peter in possession of the keys. Governor Metcalf very kindly and courteously bade us welcome to his house; and he, with his good lady, a disciple of the ancient faith, very hospitably entertained us. No house large enough for the audience could be obtained. We met in the Academy, which, by the exertions of Edward Johnson and others, was fitted up for our reception. Several hundred citizens were accommodated with seats, and we discoursed some two or three hours upon the 3d chapter of the 2d Epistle to Timothy, on *the signs of the perilous age*. We took occasion to introduce the ancient gospel, at the close, in contrast with the modern. We gave an invitation to any person to stand up and make his objections, if any he had. An old gentleman arose and emphasized on the necessity of repentance before immersion. We attended to his objection, and having pressed the necessity of obedience upon the audience, a lady of intelligence arose and confessed the Lord. We immersed her in the Kentucky river after the discourse was ended. There are a few names even in Frankfort attached to the ancient faith and order of things.

Silas M. Noel, George Waller, and John Taylor were in town. I heard that the old gentleman of pamphlet memory attended our meeting. They attempted to have a meeting that same evening in the meeting house. The keys were found by the three defenders of the kingdom of the clergy; but it is one thing to open a house and another to obtain a congregation. They rung the bell, kindled the fires, and lighted the lamps, but all in vain; only sixteen or twenty persons attending, the three preachers went home, without a preachment, to muse upon the events of the day.

From Frankfort we proceeded to brother T. Bullock's, in the vicinity of Versailles. There we met with a congregation attending upon brother J. Creath, Jun. The evening was spent very agreeably and profitably with a number of disciples, among whom were brethren Josephus Hewit and L. Fleming; and in the morning we went to the county seat. Met with brethren J. Creath, Sen. and John Smith of Montgomery, in the Versailles meeting house. A very large audience assembled, so much so that fears were entertained for the falling of the galleries by the press. We proceeded to address them from the 1st chapter of 2d Peter. The outlines of the christian worship, the royal priesthood, the spiritual temple, and the gospel means of conversion, were the topics of address to the brethren in Versailles. This is one of the churches which was cast out of the Association in August last for their preference to the New Testament. This church, with that at Clear Creek, have agreed to meet every Lord's day to keep the ordinances. After meeting, one female came forward to confess the Lord.

From Versailles we proceeded to brother Sullivan's, on the way to Bryant's Station, 17 miles distant from Versailles, where we spent the evening in company with many disciples in conversing on the

things concerning the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the morning proceeded to Bryant's. Addressed a large congregation on the calling of the Gentiles, Acts x. and xi. The burthen of this discourse was—

1. The character of Cornelius previous to his hearing the words by which he and his family were to be saved.

2. The vision of Peter and the speech of the angel concerning the importance of the words to be spoken by Peter.

3. The words spoken by Peter before the Holy Spirit fell upon them, and the first thing spoken by Peter after the interruption ceased.

4. The nature and use of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

5. Emphasized on the fact that though Cornelius was a pious man, one that feared God with all his house, prayed continually, and gave much alms to the people; yet it was necessary for him, *under the government of Jesus*, to hear words and to be immersed that he might be saved with the christian salvation.

From Bryant's we repaired to the mansion of brother B. A. Hicks, where we had a very pleasant meeting, and an interesting conversation with brethren Stone and Parmer on the affairs of the reformation. Present, brethren Creaths, Professor Richardson, Fleming, Higbie, and others with them.

Arrived in Lexington on Saturday morning, and stopped at the house of my friend Joseph Ficklin, Esq. After dining with Doctor Woods, President of the Transylvania University, with whom also, and his intelligent and amiable lady, I had the pleasure of spending another evening, we repaired to Dr. James Fishback's, where we spent the evening in a very agreeable manner; being employed by the Doctor four hours in answering questions respecting the proposed reformation, in the presence of about twenty disciples. We were so happy as to understand from the Doctor his general, if not universal concurrence in all the developements of the evening.

On Saturday, immediately after my arrival, I received a note, of which the following is a copy, handed me by a committee from the Medical Students of the Transylvania University:—

Lexington, Ky. November 17, 1830.

Dear Sir—As an evidence of the high esteem in which the Medical Class hold your literary attainments and devotion to religion, they have appointed the undersigned a committee to wait on you to request you to deliver them a sermon in their Hall, at any time during your stay in town that will best suit your convenience.

By complying with the above you will much oblige the Medical Class.

B. R. BOLV,
J. I. A. PUGH,
T. B. GREGG
} *Committee.*

I consented to deliver them a discourse the next evening. The Medical Class this year amounts to about *two hundred* students, convened from *thirteen states* of the Union. One of the Professors informed me that the present class possesses as great an amount of talent and information as has, for many years, appeared in this school.

Lord's day morning, addressed a very large and intelligent assembly, in one of the most spacious meeting houses in the state. The day being wet was favorable to the citizens of Lexington, as it prevented a crowd from the country. The third chapter of John furnished topics for the day.

After attempting to show *why* John, and none of the other Evangelists, narrated the interview with Nicodemus, we proceeded to speak of the kingdoms of nature, grace, and glory, as usually defined. The constituents of a literal kingdom were first detailed. The propriety of the application of the term kingdom to nature, grace, and glory, was next vindicated. Then the analogies between these three kingdoms were traced in the prominent characteristics of a kingdom.

1. The creation of each by *a word of God.*

2. The design of each to produce beings correspondent with its constitution—*natural* beings—*gracious* beings—*glorious* beings.

3. The adaptation of the means employed in each to the ends proposed—natural life, spiritual life, eternal life.

4. The *three* births, or the mode of introduction into each kingdom. The first birth, natural; the second birth, gracious; the third birth, glorious. The first birth, of and from the flesh; the second, of and from the water and the Spirit; the third, of and from the grave.

5. The three salvations:—1st. From natural dangers, God is thus "the Saviour of all men" in the kingdom of nature. 2d. The salvation of the soul from the guilt, pollution, and power of sin, in the kingdom of grace. 3d. The salvation of the body from the grave, or the glorification of soul and body at the resurrection of the just, and in the kingdom of glory.

6. The impossibility of being a subject or citizen of any one of these kingdoms without being born into it.

7. An illustration of the whole subject, drawn from the use and meaning of the outer court, holy place, and most holy place in the tabernacle.

In the conclusion we emphasized on the kingdom of heaven, or of grace; the import of being born of water and the Spirit, or the necessity of *regeneration*, in order to admission into the kingdom of grace. These were items in the series of illustrations presented on this occasion. After the discourse, Squire Hickman, once a Deist, cured by our writings, presented himself for immersion.

In the evening of that day addressed the Medical Class on the following questions:—

1. Has God ever spoken to man?
2. In what language has he spoken to man?
3. If in human language, how is it to be interpreted?
4. What has he said to us in his last message by his Son?

Concluded with some remarks on the necessity, happiness, and honor of obeying the Lord Jesus.

Some items of the conversation at Dr. Fishback's may be presented in our next.

EDITOR.

M'Creery's Inn, Simpson co. Ky.
2 miles from the Tennessee line, Dec. 5, 1830.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

IT being presumed that in former essays we have proved that the religious information which God, *without discrimination*, offers in sacred writ to every rational member of the human family, is, without addition, diminution, commixture, or alteration whatever; or, in other words, just as he has arranged, connected, and expressed it, not only sufficient for the purpose for which its unerring author devised, prepared, and sent it, namely, to make his ignorant and depraved creatures wise to salvation, able to lay hold on everlasting happiness and glory; but is the only modification of religious information which God has ever authorized his creature man to employ, or rendered it safe for him to use; a question naturally suggests itself, In what *manner* has God commanded us to use the information which he has sent us? Has he commanded us to read, search, and study it ourselves, and declare or publish it to our fellow-creatures just as we have received it, without impiously presuming to alter its divine order, connexion, or diction? or has he commanded us to rend it into such pieces as our wayward fancies may suggest, and tack them together again as our frolicsome humor may impel; alter and modify its sacred diction as best likes our fastidious taste, and dilute its heavenly contents with as much of our notions, conjectures, witty conceits and fanciful reveries, as we may judge fit; in short, force it to appear under all the hideous modifications, under all the disgusting transformations into which sermons, lectures, expositions, explanations, commentaries, paraphrases, creeds, confessions, catechisms, economies, orations, arguments, tracts, pamphlets, journals, and huge carcases of human divinity, &c. &c. have converted and disfigured it, and then impose on an ignorant, credulous, deceived and bigoted multitude, our wretched jumble, and tempt them to believe the glaring falsehood that we are delivering nothing to them but the pure, unmixed, unadulterated oracles of the living God?

Were all the passages of sacred writ to be quoted in which the reading, searching, studying, and publishing—the hearing, attending on, and listening to God's information, just as he has sent it, are earnestly recommended, pressingly urged, and expressly enjoined, no inconsiderable part of the Bible would be transcribed. I now quote only one: "Go and proclaim the good news to every creature," Mark xvi. 15. But where, I ask, is the good news to be found, and where is the anxiously inquiring mind to look for it? Must the inquirer repair to the words, the very words, selected and employed by the Holy Spirit to make the good news known to man, or must he encounter the appalling labor of searching the many thousand volumes, and of listening to the still greater number of oral harangues, which affect to tell us where the good news is to be found, and in what it consists? Must he consult every modification of this good news, into which daring and impious men have presumed to transform it? Surely not. For reading, then, ourselves, and publishing to others, God's blessed and all-important information just as we have received it, we have the best warrant, we have a multitude of direct

and urgent commands, and the imperative example of all inspired teachers, who never dared to alter or corrupt God's entrusted message, nor delivered to their fellow-men any of their own conceits, conjectures, fancies, or dreams intermixed with it; but rigidly confined themselves to the communication of God's inspired information alone. But where is the precept that commands, or the example that justifies the reading or publishing any other modification of divine information, than that which God has himself devised, and now offers for our use? If such there be in the Book of God, I know it not. Shall I be told that the Bible contains a command to preach the gospel, and a declaration that John the Immerser preached, that Jesus himself preached, that his Apostles and other inspired men preached? I know the Bible contains a command to publish the good news, and tells us expressly that all these persons published most assiduously the inspired messages with whose publication they were entrusted. But if the publication of inspired messages be termed *preaching*, what right or title have those uninspired harangues, called sermons, &c. to that appellation? Certainly none. Every body knows that these clerical harangues which their authors pass on a deluded multitude for divine information, are chiefly, if not entirely, made up of human, fallacious, uninspired notions and conceits, and are, of course, as unlike what the inspired teachers delivered as God's truth and by God's command, as darkness is unlike light, as falsehood is unlike truth, as black is unlike white. The one is made up of truth, truth without alloy, without one particle of error, mistake, or falsehood; the other is, at best, but a wretched jumble of truth, error, misconception, and falsehood. Indeed, the original of the New Testament contains no term which denotes what we now call preaching. It has terms which denote, with great precision, the several actions of proclaiming or publishing an inspired and entrusted message; of bringing or publishing glad tidings; of declaring or announcing generally; of conversing; of discoursing; of speaking; of teaching; of exhorting; of admonishing; of commanding, &c. but no term that denotes the multifarious, heterogeneous, undescribable operation of modern preaching. It is an art and occupation, as now followed, entirely human, and evidently invented to answer human purposes, to enable men to acquire fame, influence, wealth, and power, and pass their days in luxury and ease. True it is, all do not reach the alluring objects, the fascinating rewards of this art; but all pursue in the same track, and press on as far as they can; for these are the natural allurements and tendency of the whole invention. Nor has Christ's appalling threat, that he will most certainly reject every human invention, every human labor, every human act offered to him as an act of worship or service, which he has not commanded—been hitherto sufficient to repress their influence or resist their power. Mark vii. 7.

I well know that the silly and impertinent question has been, and will be asked by multitudes, Has not the employment of other modifications of religious information besides God's own unaltered word, done *some* good to mankind? I ask, Has any evil occurred in the world from which mankind has derived no benefit? I ask further,

because the employment of an imperfect and unsuitable instrument may be of *some* use, and be really better than *no* instrument, does it follow that we ought to prefer and continue the use of a bad instrument when we are provided with one infinitely superior? The absurdity of such a preference is reprobated and condemned by the immediate and uniform abjection of all inferior instruments as soon as better implements are discovered. Two ploughs are offered to the choice of a farmer—one of the old construction, with its clumsy wooden mouldboard, &c. and one possessed of all the modern improvements made on that important tool, the plough; what would be thought of this farmer's sense were he to prefer the former to the latter? yet the use of the former might do him *some* good, it would be better than *no* plough. Two axes lie at the foot of a stately oak—one dull, and one sharp, and the dull one is preferred and used for felling the tree; but what would you say of his wisdom who gave it the preference, although it did do him *some* good, although it enabled him to cut down the tree? Why do men who work in wood spend a great deal of time in sharpening tools? their dull tools would do them *some* good; they would enable them to execute their work in some way. But the difference between the aptitude of the best and the aptitude of the worst human inventions to execute their respective purposes, is not to be compared with the difference that exists between the fitness of God's instrument of religious instruction, just as it has come from his hands, to answer *its* purpose, and that of any of those instruments which foolish men have contrived, prepared, and actually employed as substitutes for it. I believe God has never suffered his divine message to be so thoroughly corrupted, debased, and unfitted for its purpose, as to be made altogether incapable of contributing more or less to man's salvation. No, he has determined that his word, however perverted and unfitted for the accomplishment of its object it may be rendered by the folly, presumption, and impiety of men, shall not return to him entirely void, nor wholly fail to effect the end for which he sent it. But because God has thus determined to execute his purpose, and defeat all human efforts to render his message wholly abortive, and though in its corrupted and debased state it has still continued to do *some* good, does it follow from this that men have not corrupted, debased, and unfitted for its purpose God's instrument of religious information; that they have not in a great measure laid it aside, and employed in its place instruments of their own device and fabrication, of infinitely inferior fitness to do good than that which they disuse; and thus done every thing in their power to render God's message, by their presumptuous adulteration of it, of no effect? Nor let those religious societies, who in their public worship read a great deal of sacred writ, and make its reading a principal part of their worship, attempt to justify, under this laudable and commanded practice, their use of human inventions to complete the rest. For, to resort to an illustration already used, this is a lively image of the fool, who, after employing a sharp axe to fell in part a stately oak, lays it aside, and uses a dull one to cut through the rest.

Now it is my firm belief that, if instead of these fashionable modifications of God's information, now so loudly extolled and universally adopted, as much of it, just as it appears in sacred writ, was well read every Lord's day, when people come together to worship God jointly and publicly, as their time would permit, accompanied with fervent prayer, grateful praise, a contribution for the relief of human misery, or the support of those who voluntarily devote their time and strength to an unadulterated publication of the good news among mankind, and a solemn and affectionate, but unostentatious commemoration of the Redeemer's death; and were all Christ's professed friends earnestly to recommend in private the Bible to their fellow-creatures, and rehearse or read it to them whenever providence afforded an opportunity, and urge the daily reading of it on their children and domestics, and set that pious and moral example before their fellow-men which christians are bound to set; I say, I do verily believe that if this course were diligently and steadily pursued, christianity would soon put on an infinitely more prosperous and inviting aspect than it now wears. We should soon see one faith, one immersion, one spirit, and that a spirit of harmony, peace, purity, mutual love, and mutual confidence overspread our earth. From the same plain information, imparted through the same plain heavenly words, to minds unbiassed and uninfluenced by sectarian dogmas, and untrammelled by sectarian prejudices, what other result could possibly be?

We do, then, distinctly admit, that some good may have been done by God's word by divine information, even in its most adulterated state, even when most diluted, corrupted, and debased by human notions, conjectures, and reveries intermixed with it, and human constructions put upon it; but we have no doubt that if the time had been spent and the attention paid to the reading and studying of God's information, just as he has offered it to us in the original words of sacred writ, which has been bestowed on human modifications of it, on creeds, catechisms, tracts, sermons, lectures, paraphrases, commentaries, expositions, economies, and huge bodies of human divinity, &c. &c. christian knowledge, feeling, and practice would have been as superior to what they now are, as truth is superior to falsehood, or light to darkness. And moreover, were divine information, unaltered and unmixed with human thought and verbage, alone resorted to for religious instruction, God would be honored as he ought to be; he would be regarded as a superior, as a sufficient teacher; but when his information is altered, mixed, and modified by men, before it is accounted fit for use, God is manifestly dishonored, and treated as a teacher inferior to ignorant, fallible, blundering men, and a practice which manifestly dishonors the Deity is established and absurdly styled his worship.

Note.—On this subject let the following passages be consulted:—Exodus xxiv. 7. Deuteronomy iv. 9, 10—vi. 7—xi. 19.—xvii. 19.—xxxi. 11. 2 Chronicles xxxiv. 18, 24, 30. Nehemiah viii. 8—xiii. 11. Luke iv. 16. Acts viii. 30—xv. 21. 1 Corinthians ii. 13—iii 2. Colossians iv. 16. 1 Thessalonians v. 27. 1 Timothy iv. 13. Rev. i. 3.

PHILALETHES.

PROPHECIES—No. VI.

ANALYSIS OF DANIEL'S PROPHECIES.

1st VISION—IMAGE.

Chap. 2.	Gold, Assyrian Empire, Silver, Medo-Persian Empire, Brass, Grecian Empire, Iron and Clay, Roman Empire,	*Christian Kingdom*, or *little stone.*

2d VISION—BEASTS.

Chap. 7.	Assyrian Beast, Persian Beast, Grecian Beast, Roman Beast, Millennium, kingdom of Christ.	*Catholicism.*

3d VISION.

Chap. 8.	Medo-Persian Ram, Grecian he-Goat,	*Mahomedanism.*

4th VISION.

	Medo-Persian Empire, Grecian Empire, Roman Empire,	*Atheism.*

The above is a scheme of Daniel's general prophecies, which I have been enabled to construct from the writings of the interpreters. It exhibits at one view the *four political* and *four mental* powers, which for centuries past have ruled and influenced the bodies and minds of the most enlightened portion of the human species.

1. It will be observed that the above set of chronological prophecies consists of four distinct visions, and that each successive one is characterized from the preceding by the introduction of *a new mental power*. In the first vision which was vouchsafed to Nebuchadnezzar, and interpreted by Daniel, the four political powers are set forth under the dazzling symbol of a splendid metallic image, and the first of the mental powers, viz. christianity, under the figures of a *little stone* and a *great mountain*.

2. The second vision was seen by the Prophet himself and interpreted to him at his own request by the angel. It is substantially the first prophecy repeated under a new set of symbols, viz. four beasts instead of four metals, with the introduction of a new mental power, viz. *Catholicism*, which the angel describes locally, circumstantially, and chronologically as arising in the West amid the troubles of the Roman Empire, acquiring a triple crown, blaspheming God, changing times and laws, and wearing out the saints of the Most High, for the long period of twelve hundred and sixty years.

3. The third vision introduces a third mental power, viz. *Mahomedanism*, arising in the East when the transgressions of the apostate christians were come to the full. This power is described as destroying

the holy people, magnifying himself, and opposing Christ the Prince of Princes.

Mahomet retired to his cave in company with Sergius, an apostate christian minister, to form the Alcoran, in 606, the very year in which the saints in the West were given into the hands of the Pope by the tyrant Phocas. So we see that the apostate mental power of Mahomedanism in the East, and the apostate mental power of Catholicism in the West, originated in the same year, *i. e.* in 606; and as they were to continue for twelve hundred and sixty years to oppose and oppress christianity, we have only to add 1260 to 606 in order to obtain the year when God shall commence their utter destruction. These two numbers added together bring us down to the year 66 of the present century.

4. *The fourth vision introduces a fourth mental power, viz. *Atheism*, described as being self-willed, elevating itself above every god, and in an especial manner speaking marvellous things against the true God, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, whom the Prophet styles "the desire of women;" and, in short, disregarding every god, until, for political purposes, it unites itself again to Catholicism, from whose bosom it originally sprung. All this has been verified in the history of France, where Atheism was publicly set up by the national authorities in 1793.

This Atheistical power was to flourish until *the time of the end*, the period allotted for the prevalence of Atheism, Mahomedanism, and Catholicism. Atheism is with great propriety believed by interpreters to be the real Antichrist which was to appear in the last days, because it denies both the *Father* and the *Son*.

This mental power has diffused itself all over France, Switzerland, many parts of Germany and the Netherlands; it is to be found in Scotland, England, and Ireland, and is now publicly proclaimed and defended in certain periodical prints in the United States, where a number of distinguished foreigners, lured hither by the political freedom of our land, have succeeded in forming a nucleus of Atheism,

Antichrist.—Various and often contradictory have been the opinions of men concerning Antichrist. Le Clerc supposed the rebel Jews to be Antichrist, and Vanderhest made it the Sanhedrim; Grotius explained it of Rome papal, and many have supposed it to be the Roman Emperors; but the Council of Gap awarded this title to the Pope; and Henry IV. of France was not a little mortified to be thus declared an Imp of Antichrist. Hypolitus, however, held the Devil himself to be Antichrist, and that he would appear in human shape before the end of the world. But all this discrepancy is the mere result of impatience in the interpreters; and those who have been favored with a fuller developement of God's providence have very properly explained Antichrist of the French nation, when, in the year '93, the public authorities declared the people free from every mental power of Mahomet, the Pope, Christ, and even God, and this is doubtless the true and genuine era of the present *mental independence* so much boasted of. Those who advocate the mental independence of Atheism have blundered in fixing its chronology to 1827—they should have dated it from '93, when the French nation openly excommunicated every mental power, and gave a public sanction to Atheism. The lawless rodomontade of a few individuals in these states will never be accounted for an era in any matter.

and bid defiance to every thing affecting to be from God, whether law or gospel.

Whether these things be exactly so or not, it is very certain that the first vision shows us the origin of Messiah's kingdom under the figure of "a little stone;" and the second vision shows it at the beginning of Millennium, when "the beast" (*i. e.* the Roman Empire) is slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame; then is Messiah, the only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, exhibited in all his glory.

"I saw," says Daniel, "in the night visions, and behold one like the *Son of Man* came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days; and they brought him near before him, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Thus christianity is shown to be not a scheme of mediation only, but a system of universal government also, having God for its author. "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Messiah." "Behold he cometh on clouds, and every eye shall see him."

DANIEL.

THE RECANTATION OF DANIEL GRIFFING;

OR,

The Renunciation of the Holy Scriptures as a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, through the influence of Persecution.

FROM THE BAPTIST CHRONICLE.

Jefferson, Mississippi, October 10, 1830.

DEAR BROTHER CHAMBERS—I feel it my duty as a servant of Jesus Christ, to cast in my mite in defence of the truth. I have been a reader of Mr. Alexander Campbell's *Christian Baptist* from its earliest appearance in this state, it being recommended by brother Burch as a good periodical work, until he (brother Burch) discovered, as he supposed, its baneful effects. I continued to contend for his views, (namely,) that the Scriptures as they stand were sufficient for the government of the churches, without any written creed, confession of faith, or covenant, so strenuously, (and contemplated on constituting on A. Campbell's principles,) till at length I fell under the displeasure of the church called "*Fellowship*," and suffered myself to be expelled, with others dissenting with me, on the same principles. * * * * At length, my mind ruminating on the subject, it pleased God to convince me that such a stand taken by a minister of the gospel, in the present state of the churches, must terminate in anarchy and confusion. I also discovered that this reforming notion must eventually result in the destruction of the union and fellowship of the churches, under the influence of such teachers. Being fully convinced of the error, and also of the false and disorganizing character of Mr. Campbell's views of experimental religion, his "historic faith" in Christ, and his views of christian baptism, I was constrained to return to my brethren, with (I hope) an humble acknowledgment of my sin; and endeavored to exhort my brethren to beware of Campbellism; and I felt like I desired to live to let all my brethren know that I renounce, in toto, the doctrines of Alexander Campbell. And now, brother

Chambers, you will much oblige your friend and brother by giving a place to this communication in your excellent periodical. DANIEL GRIFFING.

REMARKS.

And so it came to pass, that *Daniel Griffing*, while under the censures of the church—while given over to Satan—was brought to see the great sin he had committed in "contending that the Scriptures, as they stand, were sufficient for the government of the churches, without any written creed, confession of faith, or covenant;" of which sin he sincerely repents, and now most cordially renounces "the Scriptures, as they stand, as sufficient for the government of the churches:" and now resolves from this time forth that he will teach that "the Scriptures, as they stand, are not sufficient for the government of the church," if the church will release him from the pains of excommunication. In coming before the church, and in soliciting the repeal of the anathema, he avers that "it pleased God to convince him, after ruminating on the subject, that such a stand to be taken by any minister of the gospel," viz. "that the Scriptures, as they stand, are sufficient for the government of the church," "must terminate in anarchy and confusion." If Daniel Griffing may now be believed, it would seem that God has, by a new revelation of the Spirit, independent of the word, taught him that the writings of men are more perfect than his own writings: for they can do, what God's word, without them, could not do—viz. constitute a sufficient rule for the government of God's church. Why did not the Spirit teach him this before he fell under the anathema, if the Spirit did not use the anathema as a means of illuminating him upon this subject? This is not a physical influence for which the penitent Griffing contends, and of which he was a subject: for it pleased this Spirit of which he speaks to use the anathema as a means of convincing him that his own word was defective. If the anathema had not fallen upon this humble penitent, the Spirit would have had no means of convincing him of his error. What a blessing was this anathema! I hail it as such; for it was the means not only of convincing friend Griffing of the delusion he was under in thinking God's word to be a sufficient rule of faith and manners, but it was the happy instrument of removing from the ranks of the *reformers* a man-fearing and a time-serving spirit, and of associating him with kindred spirits, with whom he can feel himself at home, and with whom he can fraternize in all good conscience.

But we ought not to dismiss this recantation without observing to what lengths the opposers of reform push their efforts, even to the excommunication of a person for no other alleged crime than the simple impiety of saying, that the Scriptures, as they stand, are sufficient to govern the church; I will, therefore, oblige both Daniel Griffing, John Burch of Mississippi, and the church called "Fellowship," by publishing to all the readers of this work their anathema and his solemn recantation of his former veneration for the apostolic writings, and renunciation of allegiance to them as a perfect rule of faith and manners.

Mulberry Grove, near Nashville, Dec. 9, 1830.

MR. BRANTLY IN AN AGONY.

An Uncivil War.—Mr. Campbell seems to have a tough pen, and a short memory. In his last number of the so styled *Millennial Harbinger*, he says—"I never said, nor insinuated that religion is a state. No man of sense can affirm that religion is a state." In the Extra No. of the same work, which we noticed not long since, the same Mr. Campbell says—"The converts made to Jesus Christ by the Apostles, were taught to consider themselves pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and were addressed as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons, by all who first preached the gospel of Christ. Whilst this proposition is before us, it may be expedient to remark, that all these terms are expressive, not of any quality of mind; not of any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit; but each of them represents, and all of them together represent *a state, or condition.*" But above, the same writer says—"*I never said, nor insinuated that religion was a state.*" Truly it may be said, *Mendacem oportet esse memorem.*

"We perceive the evasion which he contemplates when he denies having said that religion is a state. He means to slip through the meshes of ambiguity in the term "*religion.*" He means to tell us that by religion he understands nothing more than the gospel or the institute of Christ or his Apostles. But we beg to remind him of his own assertion. He says, "*Sanctified represents a state or condition, and not any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit.*" But to be *truly* religious, and to be sanctified, are considered one and the same thing the world over; consequently, the term *religious* represents a "*state or condition;*" and not any "*attribute of soul or spirit,*" according to Mr. Campbell, since things must be equal to one another, if they be equal to the same thing. We were, therefore, right in alleging that he had affirmed religion to be a state, and not a character. Mr. Campbell now positively denies that he ever said or insinuated such a thing!" *Col. Star.*

REMARKS.

Mr. Brantly, in his usual courtesy, after applying to me in Latin the adage that "it behoves a liar to have a good memory," still attempts to justify himself in calling religion a *character*, and labors to make me assert it to be a *state*. I shall use no epithets in expressing my astonishment at the temerity and pretended ignorance of this scribe, lest any should think I resented his vulgarity. Has he proved that I said that religion was a state! Would he have us to believe that he is so ignorant as to suppose that the quotation from the Millennial Extra proves his allegation! Is the term "pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, or saved," equivalent in his view to the word *religion?!!* These he would appear to think to be convertible terms. My not agreeing to use the word *pardoned*, &c. as a convertible term with the term *religion*, he calls an evasion. It is not true that I "intend to slip through the meshes of ambiguity in the term *religion:*" for I assert that it is never used as synonymous with, or equivalent to, any one, or all of the above terms; and that *to be sanctified* and *to be religious* whether equivalent or not, is not the question: but is, *to be sanctified*, and the term *religion*, convertible terms? This Mr. Brantly dares not affirm; but by a real *evasion*—a mere trick—substitutes the term *religious* for *religion*, and strives to make his reader believe that I use the terms *religion* and *religious* as convertible terms; or, what is the same thing, that I deny the term *religious* to be applicable to the word *state*. This I have never done. The whole matter terminates here. Is a *religious state* equivalent

to the word *religion?* Because the adjective *religious* applies to *state*, is it thence to be inferred that the noun *religion* is also applicable to the term *state?*

Another evasion appears in the following assertion:—"To be *truly* religious, and to be sanctified, are considered to be one and the same thing all the world over." This he would palm upon the reader as the controversy. This I might either admit or deny, and still it will neither logically nor grammatically follow that the term *religion* denotes a *state* or *character*, which is the only question of controversy on this subject. Mr. Brantly has given it up by substituting *religious* for *religion;* but he does it not as gentlemen and christians are wont to do. To say that *matrimony* and *married* are convertible terms is even less egregious than to say that *religion* and *sanctified* are terms equipollent.

This appears to be a mere controversy about a word. Mr. Brantly having failed in detecting a single error in the Extra No. 1, is now seeking for an assylum in this reiteration of a mere quibble. He has fallen down to a single word. It may appear cruel in me not to give him a single word for a hiding place; but he seeks it with so much apparent perversity, and without even the semblance of reason, that we cannot permit him to raise on our premises a cover for his retreat. He must pitch his tent upon his own ground. I trust the reader will recollect that this is not a controversy about a word, but about the most important item in the christian institution, and that a pretended scribe, who places himself in the highest chair, has no other escape from the evidence and argument than by raising a quibble about a word, and insulating that from the whole connexion of things of great moment in which it stood.

It is not so marvellous, that if Mr. Brantly be so dishonest, he should have to complain of his patrons as he does in his number of the 20th November, He says, "Hardly a day comes without 50 or 75 cents postage for the sad news of a discontinuance. This is miserable treatment." p. 335. It is no wonder that men of sense should get tired of such a course as Mr. Brantly pursues; nor that they should *evade the postage* as Mr. Brantly has taught them to *evade the argument.* Miserable treatment all round!!

Mulberry Grove, near Nashville, Ten.
December 9, 1830. EDITOR.

THE BAPTIST CHRONICLE & LITERARY REGISTER.

ERASTRATUS, one of the most ignoble men that Asia gave birth to, immortalized himself by burning the *Temple of Diana*, one of the Seven Wonders of the World. He did it for the express purpose of preserving his name from oblivion. And although the Common Council of Ephesus decreed that his name should not be mentioned, all historians have recorded it as one of the most signal proofs of the excesses to which an exorbitant vanity may carry a weak and infatuated mind. Some men will be famous at any price. If they have not

virtues to elevate them, they will seek renown even by the magnitude of their vices. They will rise upon the ruin of themselves. A name they must have if it should cost both body and soul. Samuel Patch, not content with leaping from the surface of the Falls of Niagara, not satisfied with the fame of such an exploit, erected a scaffold one hundred feet high above the Falls, from which to precipitate himself over this stupendous cataract. He found *subscribers* not only to witness, but to pay for the sight; and in their presence plunged himself into the tremendous abyss, from which he returned not to laugh with his admirers.

"Tis better to reign in hell than to serve in heaven," is now an article, not only in the creed of Satan, but in the practice of men. If men will look on, laugh, and pay for the sport, some individuals will gambol like a Satyr, and play such pranks as might make angels weep, if tears they had to shed. The actors in the orthodox drama of the present day are not altogether superior to an imputation of this sort. Fame has not lost all its charms in their eyes. To this no man ought to object, if it were the fame of a benefactor. But such fame as is sought by the *dramatis personæ* of the Baptist Chronicle and Literary Register, is not unequivocally that to which a christian might aspire.

Some men rise and fall with the times. Others know this to be the fact. Hence the eagerness with which they watch the movements of public opinion, and the promptitude with which they mount the hobby most likely to carry them into fortune and fame. How much, for example, has been achieved by many individuals by timously espousing the cause of the Hero of New Orleans! Men are now in power, all will admit, whose sole merit consisted in their early prognostication of the fortunate candidate. Men are now basking in the full blaze of presidential patronage, whose fortune would have been quite the reverse had they been less skilled in political divination. But hobbies, like other animals, are *mortal;* and there will arise a king who knew not Joseph. Those now out of dignity will become better skilled in the signs of the times, and will, in a propitious moment, break some new hobby to the saddle, or yoke their fortunes to the car of some new aspirant; and then comes the crash of the old nobility and the induction of the new.

Well would it be if this sort of divination were confined to the rulers of this world, and to those who know the value of political loaves and fishes. But in the world falsely called religious, we have not only many hobbies, but many to ride them. Hence creeds, associations, mystical regeneration, and physical operations, are seized by the discontents; and some men, whose virtues, talents, and information would never have carried them out of their native county, are riding full tilt at the head of admiring multitudes; and their fame bids fair to be as permament as the cause which they oppose. It is owing to this peculiarity in the fortunes of human affairs, that Pontius Pilate and Herod are as famous as either Joseph of Arimathea or Nicodemus.

and that Judas Iscariot descends to every age with the Saviour whom he betrayed.

The Baptist Chronicle affords texts for many sermons of this sort. Its *ostensible* editor, with its *real* authors, have given to themselves a conspicuity which honest men with their talents never could have achieved. Before they seized the prejudices of the people, and mounted the sectarian hobbies, thousands in Kentucky had more religious reputation and influence than the *chronicler* himself: and as for those who use him as their Jambres, they were in the utmost need of some such instrument either to save them from religious bankruptcy, or to give them a little capital with which to push their fortune. The facts and documents which I have to give in detail, illustrative and corroborative of these statements, are numerous and decisive; but in Kentucky they are not called for, and out of it they are unnecessary. An *expose* of the *literary*, *moral*, and *religious* character of a single number is all that I intend at present, and all that is necessary to give to those at a distance a sample of the men and measures which the opposition to reform in Kentucky has in its front.

We choose the last number of the Chronicle which appeared, because it is the only one accessible to us. As it calls itself the *Literary* Register, we shall give a sample of the literary and critical taste and talent of the club. p. 163:—

"To *reform* the ordinance of baptism as much as possible, *our reformers* have discovered, or rather *invented* a new *ceremony*. They now immerse *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, instead of baptize *in* the name, &c. as formerly. I have not much objection to the word *immerse*, though I see no necessity for the use of it. Baptize implies the same thing, and being more commonly used, is more familiar and better understood; consequently it should be preferred. But the word *into*—how *nonsenical* would it be for a man to say he was commanded *into the name* of the commonwealth to do any thing! or that he had done something *into the nome* of the commonwealth. And is it more *nonsensical* thus to speak, than for a minister to say he had baptized a person *into the name of the Lord!* If there be any analogy in language, there is not. But do *our reformers* thus translate the word because it is better sense? Admitting it to be either or both of these, we should then tsanslate the following passages in a similar manner; and hereafter we should read Matt. xxi. 9. not "blessed is he that cometh *in* the name of the Lord," but *into the name* of the Lord. Mark ix. 38. not "Master, we saw one casting out devils *in* thy name," but *into* thy name. Same chapter, 39th verse, not "There is no man that can do a miracle *in* my name," but do a miracle *into* my name. Same chapter, 41st verse, not "Whosoever shall give you a cup of water *in* my name," but *a cup of water into* my name. Luke x. 17. not "Even the devils are subject to us *through* thy name," but *into* thy name. Mark xix. 38. not "Blessed is the King that cometh *in* the name of the Lord," but cometh *into* the name of the Lord. John iii. 15. not "Whosoever believeth *in* him should not perish," but believeth *into* him, &c.

But I need proceed no further. Every tyro in Greek, every person understanding only his native tongue, would blush to vindicate a translation that would introduce into the Scriptures such *puerilities*—such pitiful *absurdities*. Suppose we were to analyze their ceremony:—"I immerse thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." *Immerse*—What is *immerse?* To *dip into water*. Then they mean, "I dip thee *into* water *into* the name." What sense has this? Do they say, "I dip thee *into* water which is

into the name?" or "I dip thee *into* water, and *into* the name?" Tell me, you that can, what they mean? *Into the name of the Father?* Of course, according to their own logic, they put on the *name of the Father—and into the name of the Son.* Do they put on the name of the Son? Yes; the Son is called Christ, and hence they call themselves Christians. But why not put on all his names? And *into the name of the Holy Spirit.* But I can pursue them no further. It looks too much like trifling with holy things, to trace out all their absurdities. Such reasoning as theirs, if not impious, may at least be classed with what Mr. Jamieson, in his Rhetoric, calls *learned nonsense.* JUVENIS."

The writer of this pretends to be no tyro in Greek. In this he is, no doubt, sincere But *he* means *more* than a tyro—*I*, that he is incomparably *less* than a tyro. It has been ascribed to Mr. *Bacon*, Principal of the Georgetown Classical and Theological School: for none other than he of the conductors of the Chronicle, professes more than a knowledge of the Greek alphabet. But this I cannot think; for the writer of this piece certainly does not know the Greek alphabet. It is more rationally ascribed to one of the three lawyers which belong to the club. But what shall we think of the *morality* of that man who pretends to understand Greek, and to criticise a translation of the New Testament, who does not know how to read εν and εις. (*en* and *eis.*) In all the passages cited, one only excepted, it is *en*, and not *eis;* and, therefore, he mistakes the whole matter. No man pretends that *en* is to be translated *into.* Now, courteous reader, see the dilemma in which this "*Literary* Register" is placed. Either he knew, or did not know the difference between *en* and *eis.* If he knew it, he wilfully blinded his readers and slandered me, by telling them that we would have *en* translated *into*—an idea which never fell from our pen nor from our lips. And if he choose the other horn of the dilemma, he is equally guilty, or more guilty: for he pretends to know that of which he is as ignorant as an Indian, and superadds to his ignorance the crime of wilful slander, accusing a person of that which he knew not to be true, or cared not to know to be false.

As to the propriety of my rendering *eis* INTO, in the commission, I discovered yesterday in the 4th volume of Dr. Dwight's Theology, page 318, that even this learned writer vindicates the same rendering, and has used almost my own reasoning to prove that all persons should be immersed *into*, and not *in* the name, &c. This only by the way. [*See my note on this passage, New Test. 2d ed. p.* 452.]

But this is only one of the many measures pursued by those who plead for the traditions of men to prejudice those who either cannot, or will not, read for themselves; and as few of their readers know more Greek than themselves, they calculate that their reputation for orthodoxy will secure the assent of them who do not read the common version with any interest, and of course are very ill qualified to decide on the comparative merits of any other version.

The next specimen of the literature and taste of the "*Literary Register*" is taken from page 165. A writer who contributes largely for this *literary* work proves that he is not in his dotage, because he travelled many miles last Summer. The greatest simpleton I ever

saw was one of the greatest pedestrians I ever knew. But it is not the old gentleman's logic, but his *poetry* which I wish to preserve as a specimen of the talent of the opposition. The writer gives this as a proof that his intellect is as good as it ever was:—

> "But on we went, through beaming heat,
> With panting breath and trickling sweat.
> We moved on with hunger and thirst,
> Through the long lanes and clouds of dust."

Mr. Chambers had better republish this in the "poet's corner" of his "*Literary* Register." This most talented and orthodox of the opposition, after writing these *harmonious* and *poetic* lines, asks, "Now, can I be much doted as to my bodily powers?" This accomplished old gentleman says, (and is he not a good judge?) "The Georgetown Chronicle is the now best periodical in the West"!!! As the *literary* character of this work will further appear in the quotations to be made, we shall proceed to give a few specimens of its moral character:—

On page 162, one of its *moral* heroes, supposed to live in Frankfort, says, "Two months have scarcely elapsed, and Campbellism is extinct; yes, in Kentucky, it has passed rapidly on to the tomb of the Capulets. There may it find an endless repose! Amen! Amen!" This gentleman, grand manager of the opposition, author of "*the thirty-nine articles*," as it is presumed, and fabricator and purveyor for the Chronicle, has, it is said, been so disturbed in conscience as to be afraid to sleep in a room by himself without a candle. When death has been mentioned in reference to himself, or even his descent down the hill of life noticed, he has fallen into a fit of hypochondriasis. This is not so strange while his memory is legible, if on it be inscribed many such statements as the above. I wish "*Campbellism*" and *man-isms*, of all sorts, were all extinct, it is true; but what he contumaciously represents as "Campbellism," *alias* the *ancient gospel* and *ancient order of things*, so far from being "extinct in Kentucky," is more triumphant at this moment, and progressing with more rapidity than at any former period; if my own observation and the testimony of the ablest and most pious public speakers in the state may be regarded. The very same Chronicle which publishes this *religious falsehood*, speaks of the spread of these sentiments, and asks for information how far these principles are spreading. *Out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee*—out of your own publication I will show how little reliance may be placed in you, the *chroniclers* of Kentucky. Page 169—"Here are eight churches in which Mr. C's writings have caused divisions to a positive certainty, all within sixty miles of Georgetown. And besides these, there are others within the same distance, of which we cannot speak definitely. We desire to be informed by our friends of *the extent* of the divisions not named. In Louisville a division has recently taken place, each party excluding the other on the same day." Yet "Campbellism is extinct in Kentucky"?! These writers accuse others of lying!!! I am not a little surprized that such men, if they believe in the government of Jesus

Christ, which I think is very problematical, could think that, admitting we were in error, they could put it down, or that any blessing could be expected to attend such a system of misrepresentation, proscription and intrigue? Is it not proverbial in Kentucky, that in no political contest was there ever exhibited more of the works of the flesh, than the enemies of reform have exhibited during the last year? Yet these men talk about the sin of making divisions, of which they are themselves the only legitimate authors. If Campbellism were as wicked as Jezebelism, such unrighteous means and such immoral agents could not put it down. No one can say that Satan now acts like an angel of light.

These infatuated men may be so ignorant as to suppose that their anathemas and decrees, because sustained by the prejudices of a part of the people, are the extinction of reform. But nothing which such men could do, could help it more. How many preachers of reform in Kentucky have been brought back by these measures? How many of the friends of reform have deserted the ranks? And how many have associated with them? Let some responsible person name them, and thus demonstrate how the reformation is extinct!

John Taylor says, "Campbellism begins to fall faster than it ever began to rise," page 166 of the same Chronicle. Either John Taylor, or Dr. Noel, the supposed author of "*Menno*," must, themselves being judges, be placed in an awkward position here. The former says, "It begins to fall"—the latter says, "It is extinct;" and the Chronicle affirms it has recently been increasing; or, what is the same thing, that "a division has very recently taken place in Louisville." There is confusion among the Babel repairers.

In page 173 there is a very full specimen of the *morality* of the Editor. In the first place he represents the "*Christian Examiner*" as dead. His words are, "The Christian Examiner, the little pamphlet heretofore published in Lexington by Norwood and Creath, has withered and died." He immediately adds that it is to be published in Louisville. If he had not shown that he is apprised of the fact that Louisville, rather than Lexington, was preferred by the Editors of the Examiner, because of greater facilities for carrying on the work, we might have supposed him innocent in saying that because it ceased to be issued from Lexington, it had died. But let those of a conscience not polluted with falsehoods, judge how this *religious* gentleman could say that the Christian Examiner was dead. If Mr. Chronicle had removed his printing-office across the street, and I had said the Chronicle "had withered and died," he would have filled a column with vituperations: anathemas and defamations, in all the mazes of scurrilous volubility, would have ornamented every sentence.

An extract from "Carlile's Life of Paine," furnished by *A Traveller*, for the 9th number of the *Harbinger*, is made a text by the *Chronicle* for preaching to the people that I am about to become a Deist. The happy exit of Paine, as reported, was intended to show how little confidence can be reposed in the happy exits of men whose lives are at war with religion and morality. Could I have supposed that there

was any man so stupid as to think that we had any faith in the happy death of a wicked man, other than as he may die insensible as a beast, I should, like a certain painter, have written the name of the animal below the painting. It is, however, probable, that if any person should say that the Editor of the Chronicle had, without reformation, "died in perfect composure and resignation," I might publish it without note or comment; as another proof of the delusion of irrational theories—as another proof of how little consequence it is for a man of an unrighteous life to say he dies in peace with God and man.

A third proof of the *morality* of the *chronicler*, is the remarks made by him on an extract from page 442 of the *Harbinger*, concerning the character of some spirits opposed to reformation. He labors hard to make his readers think that I intended these characters for Messrs. John Taylor, Brantly, Clopton, &c. After he has elaborated these insinuations, and worked up the mind of his readers into a belief that these were the persons designated, he pours out his furies upon me in the following strains:—"The God of heaven sees through the veil behind which this modern Munzer attempts to shelter his wickedness. A most striking evidence of an entire prostration of moral principle in this affair, is, Mr. C's utter disregard of truth. One source of consolation among the friends of truth, is, that Mr. C's entire destitution of candor and disregard for truth are becoming so notorious, that his arrows of detraction are rapidly losing their point and venom, and fall comparatively innoxious at the feet of those whom he would injure." The reader will please to remember, that although Mr. Chambers is a lawyer, he professes to be a religious and *moral* man. Now had Mr. Chambers proved first that these were the persons of whom I spake: and in the second place, that they were innocent of the charge, the above vulgar abuse would not even then been admissible. But what shall we say of it when I have positively excepted these, and excluded the logical possibility of them, or any of them mentioned by him, as being included or alluded to in the remarks quoted. The persons alluded to are marked out as "*the first* to stir up sedition among the people." They are again described as once having some influence among the people, and as having lost it. Yet with these designations, limitations, and restrictions before him, regardless of them, he represents these characters as possibly applying to those persons he named, and then denounces me as if they certainly were the persons intended.

But instances of this sort are numerous in every number of the Chronicle which I have read. On the cover of this same 11th number, concerning my visit to Georgetown, there are several falsehoods; but so palpable, that few, if any, can believe them; such as my saying that "nothing is more absurd than to call upon a sinner to repent." Such misrepresentations carry their own cure with them. To make even religious lies credible, they must not be quite so gross. This is, however, not a grosser misrepresentation than many others from the same source. This writer only wants time to render himself incredible to

all who think. Can any person believe him moral or sincere in thanking me for my visit to Kentucky, because he represents it as likely to aid his cause, while in the same breath he recommends the shutting of the meeting houses against me; and that by publishing, upon his own responsibility, that neither myself nor my friends will be permitted to occupy hereafter the Baptist pulpit in Georgetown? Why, then, Mr. Chambers, thank me for my visit, and represent my discourses as injurious to the spread of the principles I plead? If you cannot believe yourself sincere and honest, how can others believe you?

This is a meagre specimen of the *morality* of the opposition. I proposed also to furnish a specimen of the *religion* of this editorial club, from the number before me; but in reviewing it the only specimens are such as the following:—"If this" (myself) "*papas supremus* of the *Reformers* be right, why was not Simon Magus a christian?" "Mr. Campbell, I can neither attend to you nor any of your *understrappers*." p. 164. "These outlandish renegado preachers." "Do you know, sir, there is a heavy rod in soak for you?" p. 166. "Belching forth the most furious splenetic and slanderous vituperation of which the foulest malignant heart could be susceptible." "How vile and relentless must be the heart of him, who, sheltered under the apparent sanctity of his ministerial cloth, will, without remorse or scruple, deliberately and with malice aforethought, thrust his envenomed poinard of detraction into the vitals of the fairest reputations." "Who but Alexander Campbell and his reckless followers would do it?" p. 173. These are a few samples of the religious feeling, and of the gracious words of the Chronicle and those who aid him in supporting the projects of the opposition.

Such is a fair sample of the literary, moral, and religious character of the "*Baptist Chronicle and Literary Register*," of Georgetown, Kentucky. I have hitherto paid little attention to it; and if my readers will forgive me, I think it will be a long time before I trouble them with another notice of a work which no man can touch without being polluted. It has been now for nearly one year abusing myself and many of the most intelligent and pious men in Kentucky, in the style of this 11th number. It is due to the friends of reform, to the cause which I plead, and to the next generation, that such samples of the talents, taste, morality, and religious character of the opposition to reform, should be preserved and exhibited. But we will content ourselves, and, I think, our readers will be contented with this notice of the first book of the Chronicles of the advocates of the priesthood, the creeds, and the traditions of the elders. While our opponents have *reason* to offer we shall attend to them; but to render abuse for abuse, and railing for railing, we have neither time nor taste; and, what is still more decisive, the King positively forbids it.

Mulberry Grove, Tennessee,
Deeember 24, 1830.

EDITOR.

CANDOR.

ALL that we have ever asked is conceded to us here—a candid examination, an argumentative opposition, and, if it can be produced, a scriptural refutation, or a cordial reception:— *Ed. M. H.*

"*Mr. A. Campbell, of Bethany, Va.*—However correct or incorrect Mr. Campbell's religious opinions may be, we think it may be said of him, as Dr. Johnson said of Goldsmith, "*Nil tetigit quod non ornavit*,"—that he has touched no subject which he has not adorned. We have given some extracts in to-day's paper, from his "*Millennial Harbinger–Extra*," which we think will be read with interest. Mr. Campbell is, no doubt, cordially despised by many sectaries, and denounced as a "disorganizer," a "reformer," and a "dangerous man;" but one thing, we believe, will not be denied, that wherever his *Christian Baptist* or *Millennial Harbinger* is read, it begets a desire to "search the Scriptures;" that the New Testament particularly is more generally read, and there is a more thorough inquiry "whether these things be so." There is, in this country, a novelty in the doctrine contained in these extracts that cannot fail to attract attention. If Mr. Campbell be right, it seems to us that he has presented the subject of religion in a most beautiful, simple, and fascinating light. That mysticism and priestcraft may seek to hide their deformities in vain, when compared to the alluring aspect of the simple and naked truth. If he be wrong, his writings should be met *and refuted;* and to do this he challenges the world. If his doctrine be correct, we wish our readers to have the benefit of it, so far as our extracts extend. If it be wrong, *it is dangerous*, and should be mildly but vigorously opposed; and this is our reason, if it be necessary to give any, for the extracts. Religion is surely a rational subject, and one which will not shrink from investigation; for truth is consistent, immutable, and will prevail." [*Huntsville Democrat.*]

MONTHLY RECEIPTS OMITTED IN THE DECEMBRE NO.

William Polke, Vincennes, Ind paid for himself, H D Wheeler, P Ruley, J Reed, and Mrs Beeman. J L Bustis, Brookneal, Va. paid for himself and J Calloway; also, 1 dollar for John Bustis. T J Latham, Pantego, N. C. paid for himself. E Sweat, Lebanon, Ten. paid 3 dollars, for whom not stated. J Park, Knoxville, Ind paid for himself, J Blackstone, E Whitington, and Dr Williams. A Weimer, Batesville, O. paid for himself. R Thompson, Georgetown, Ky. paid for himself, S G Marshall, J W Grant, J Stricklen, J Tombleson, B S Chambers, J Gaines, Col W Johnson of the Great Crossings, and H Marshall of Frankfort. G W Young, Augusta, Ga. paid for himself. J Terril, Dover, paid for himself and J Biggs. J Spencer, Lebanon, Ky. paid for himself and J Coppage; also, 1 dollar for F Roy. A Kirkpatrick, Meigsville, Ten. paid for H Hall, P Mulkey, William Hamilton, and himself; also vol. 2 for N Fisk of Hilham. T Nichols, Maysville, Ky. paid for himself. A Runyan, May's Lick, Ky. paid 50 dollars through T Campbell, Sen. (names not stated.) G Archer, Decatur, O. paid 10 dollars through T Campbell, Sen. (names not given.) J Hall, Carlisle, Ky. paid for himself Charles Williams, Mount Sterling, Ky. paid for himself. J Collerman, Flemingsburg, Ky. paid 8 dollars, for whom not stated. D Crawford, Georgetown, O. paid for himself. T J Murdock, Burlington, Ky. paid for J Stephens, P Price, Miss Frances Spencer and Mr Pearson. J Butterford and J W Martin, Wheeling, Va. paid

for themselves. W Cole, Wilmington, O. paid for J Shockley, J Howe, W. Hibbins, J Vandernort, A Wilson, D Radcliff and Dr U Farquhar. Joseph Doddridge, Esq. Williamsport, O. paid for himself, George Alkine and F Graham. S Stone, South Hill, Va. paid for Eliza-Ann Creath. F V Sutton, White Chimneys, Va. paid for C Coleman and W Allen. N H Turner, Jackson, Va. paid for W C Thomas and Miss Sarah H Vest, also, 1 dollar for Miss Sarah Purrington. J Patton, Jun. Paris, Ky. paid for G Gates and W S Bryant, also, 1 dollar for L Warfield. W Vadon, Bolivar, Ten. paid for himself. N P Goodall, Kirkland Mill, O paid for himself. W Bootwright, Richmond, Va. paid for M W Webber, B Gates, L L Montague, D Carder and William Piper. J Jackson, Jetersville, Va. paid for W C Jackson, and T E Jeter; also, 1 dollar for himself. J Smith, Economy, Ind. paid for T P Burras; also, 1 dollar for himself. T J Allen, Bricksville, O. paid for himself and J Patrick. W Hayden, Austintown, O paid for J Cotton and W Shakspear. J W Fort, Denmark, Ten. paid for J B Fort, Dr W Evans, B Hill, E Cross, and himself. H Edwards, Bloomfield, Ky. paid for J Summers and D Lewis; also, 1 dollar for S Stone. P Stout, La Grange, Ala. paid for A Ricks and J M Northcross; also, one dollar for himself. N K Whitney, Kirkland Mills, O. paid for himself. D M'Donough, Washington, Pa. paid for J M'Donough, J Pangburn, and J Witherow. P S Van Ingan, Albany, N. Y. paid vols. 1 and 2 for himself. T Crane, Cincinnati, O. paid for himself. P Applegate, Green Castle, Ind. paid A R Runyan, May's Lick, Ky. for the following persons: George Piercy, R H Vandike, H Starks, W Wright, J Trigg, and B H Nichols. J Loop, Elyra, O. paid for himself and W Carter. J Chinn and N Offout, Leesburg, Ky. paid for themselves. G W Nuckles, Shelbyville, Ky. paid for J Richardson, Capt. Watts, and S Vaughan. C Hunter and L Suggett, Frankfort, Ky. paid for themselves. J Scofield, Frankfort, Ky. paid for himself. J M Dupuy, Versailles, Ky. paid for vol. 2. S Curts, Stradfort, Con. paid for himself. J Rudolph, Hiram, O. paid for J Rider. W D Jourdan, Locust Shade, Ten. paid for C Welch and J T Coffee. J B New, Vernon, Ind. paid for himself. S G Earle, Earle's Store, S. C. paid for S Hymer.

Receipts for Millennial Harbinger, Vol. I.

W Hayden, Austintown, O. paid for R Craig. J Rittenhouse, Brownsville, Pa. paid for himself and W Shanks. J Deardorff, Waynesborough, Pa. paid for himself, O Johanstock, H Strickler, P Hoover, A Stoner and E Horner. S G Earle, Earle's Store, S. C. paid for S G Clanahan. J Fosset, Columbus, Ind. paid for J Houser and E Miller. W Duffield, Springfield, O. paid for himself. J L Buster, Brookneal, Va. paid for J M'Haney and C Clements; also, 1 dollar for J Buster W Bruce, Bruceville, Ind. paid for D Davis and Elizabeth Spencer. A Kyle, Harrodsburg, Ky. paid for J Bowman, J R Chapline, D Hart, J Hewitt, Isaac Chapline, W A Bridges, J P Williams. Jacob Creath, jun. Louisville, Ky. paid for J M'Intosh, Dr H Young, and H Moore. Wm Ralls, Rushville, Ill. paid for S Henory and J Rogers, also, 1 dollar for himself. H Broom, Cambridge, O. paid for himself. Abraham Smith, Burnt Tavern, Ky. paid for himself. J N Walter, O. paid for E Phelps. O Clapp, Mentor, O. paid for Lewis Smith. D Dye, Washington, Pa. paid for himself and G Smith. T Edwards, Lebanon, Ten. paid for J Bell and W Terrill. J Anderson, Sparta, Ten. paid for T Lovelady and J Rhea; also, 1 dollar for A M'Bride, J L Hickman, Lexington, Ky. paid for himself. George Carpenter, New Store, Ky. paid for himself. E A Smith, Danville, Ky. paid for J D Ayres, W Helm, J Mullis, M A Stemmons, J Helm, jun. S Hooker, E Romine, R Hackley, C Fleece, M Helm, James Crow, E Dawson. N Waters, J Helm, sen. and Mrs P Cornett. J Ballenger, Lancaster, Ky. paid for himself. J B Edwards, King William Court-House, Va. paid for T W Atkinson and W Elliot; also, 1 dollar for C. Lipscomb. J Crum, Milton, Ind. paid 10 dollars, (for whom not stated.) J Bridgewater, Columbia, Ky. paid for himself. A Clempd, Ky. paid for himself. Joel Prewitt, Fayette, Mo. paid for Dr J Bull, J C Kerr, H Chisman, J Nanson, and George Giddings. G Fassett, Scottsville, Pa. paid for himself.

B S Hendrickson, New York, paid for E White, J Franks, T Hogg, T Stephens, H Porter, and A Bowman. F V Sutton, Bowling Green, Va. paid for C Baylor. D Kellough, Bloomington, Ind. paid for Dr S Roach. J Robison, Madisonville, Ky. paid for himself and W Noel. H C Ewing, Trenton, Ky. paid for himself. A Adams, Hadensville, Ky. paid for G Miller, T Cross and J Cross, also, 1 dollar for J and S Mallory. G W Trabue, Glasgow, Ky. paid for J Trabue, T Crenshaw, A Trigg, W Wood, jun. and W A Brush. Joseph Feland, Bowling Green, Ky. paid for himself. A Reynolds, Dripping Spring, Ky. paid for himself, J Whitton, H Jameson, J C Rountree, and M Duncan. N G Smith, St Lawrence, N. C. paid for himself. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ind. paid for J M Wilson and A Woodyard. N Ross, Martinsburg, O. paid 1 dollar for himself. J Richard's, Bowler's, Va. paid for J Janey. W Button, Covington, Ind. paid for D Anderson, R Landers, J N Spinning, J H Martin, J H Graham, J Hickman, B Restine and himself. T Purkins, Mount Pleasant, Va. paid for W Greenlaw, L Marders, R P Marshall, F Jetts, S Coghill, and himself. S E Shepherd, Alba, Pa. paid for J C Rockwell. O Newcomb, Wadsworth, O. paid for C Derthick and E Crosby. F Henry, Hollidaysburg, Pa. paid for himself. G D Boner, West Liberty, Va. paid for himself. S Young, Centreville, Miss. paid for J S Hatfield, T Sellers, W E Matthews, A Wilcox and Mrs Penelope Stewart. M. Winans, Jamestown, O. paid for Lockhart & Blain. N Smith, Wooster, O. paid for himself. Jacob Dubois, Fairfield, Ind. paid for himself and J B Haden. M D Anson, Petersburg, Va. paid for himself, A Evans, R H Thompson, W Johnson, T Brian, M Eaton, G W Harrison, A Pond, T Jordon, L H Goodrich, J J Cooper, J M Hurt, H Harris, J Swails, J M Newell and J Dickman. D Round, Ellisburg, New York, paid for himself. A Chatley, Beaver, Pa. paid for himself. J C Talliaffero, Enfield, Va. paid for himself. J Farrington, Franklin, Ten. paid for J Swanson, W Johnson, J Carl, W H Hill, S Sparkman, A Craig, W Anderson, J Park, P Youncey, D M'Phail, T H Blain, and J L Noland. J Anderson, Franklin, Ten. paid for himself and A H Olmsted; also, A Craig paid 5 dollars for subscribers, names not stated. L M'Connico and G M'Connico paid for themselves. T Alderson, Columbia, Ten. paid for himself, A Cathey, J Woodruff, M Warfield, Dr T Brown and A Martin. U M Roberts, King Creek, S C. paid for himself. M R Trimble, Sangamo, Ill. paid for C Brady, A Vance and L Cantrall. J W Williams, West Chester, O. paid 1 dollar for himself. W Hurlburt, Mount Zion, Miss. paid for himself. F V Sutton, Bowling Green, Va. paid for R Parrott. R M'Clure, Wheeling, Va. paid for J Boughner. W Sanders, Indianapolis, Ind. paid for himself. T Poindexter, Hopkinsville, Ky. paid for himself. J Briant, Hopkinsville, Ky. paid $27 75 for subscribers, names not given. W Davenport, Hopkinsville, Ky. paid for himself. S Muir, Hadensville, Ky. paid for himself. R G Kay, Bucknersville, Ky. paid for himself. James D Gerrard, Elkton, Ky paid for himself. P S Fall, Nashville, paid for himself and H Ewing. T N Loving, Nashville, Ten. paid for himself. William Hopper, Hopper's Tan Yard, Ky. paid 10 dollars for subscribers, names not stated E Creel, Greensburg, Ky. paid for himself. J P Smith, Columbia, Ky. paid for himself. L Page, Russellville, Ky. paid for S Wilson and A Burruse. L Lindsey, Bucknersville, Ky. paid for Wm Morrison, Wm Daniel and himself. T W Coleman, Oak Grove, Ky. paid for J H Robbins. A Fulkerson, Perryville, Ky. paid for himself. [*Receipts for Vol. II. crowded out of this number, shall appear in the next.*]

☞ A disappointment in the receipt of paper in due time for this number, has been the cause of its non-appearance till this time. A large supply was to have been forwarded us by the 15th ult. which, through some cause unknown to us, did not arrive here until the 6th inst. It is hoped that measures will be adopted to prevent a recurrence of a similar failure in the publication of this work.——[*Print.*]

January 22, 1831.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 2. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY*, FEBRUARY 7, 1831. Vol. II

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

NO. IV.

CONTAINING A CONVERSATION ON THE REFORMATION.

Lexington, Ky. November 20, 1830.

Dr. Fishbach—BROTHER Campbell, we want to hear from you a developement of the proposed *reformation*. In what is it to terminate?

Reply—The ultimatum of the Christian Institution is the happiness of those who submit to it. This is the design of the mediation of the Lord Jesus. What is first in every design is last in the execution. The complete and eternal bliss of the saved, was the first, or original design of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. This will be the consummation of the whole government of which he is the head. There is the present happiness of the saved, as well as the future. Our greatest objection to all the sectarian schemes, is, that not one of them terminates in giving that measure of enjoyment to the disciples which is every where proposed in the apostolic writings as the natural, legitimate, and common result of a cordial reception of the gospel, and an unreserved submission to the institutions of Jesus.

The reason is, the supreme law of the moral universe, is, that *purity must precede and issue in happiness.* The links of the golden chain are, *love*, issuing from a pure heart; a *pure heart*, issuing from a good conscience; and a *good conscience*, issuing from an active or unfeigned faith. Faith, obedience, a good conscience, a pure heart, christian love and happiness, are under the government of Jesus, indissoluble. This is the moral order of the present empire of the Prince of Life.

If the fountain be polluted, the streams are corrupt. If in the truth believed there be the least admixture of error, faith is unsound, obedience defective, the conscience partially defiled, the heart not fully purified, love is partial, and happiness incomplete.

The sectarian schemes present a corrupted gospel, and therefore fail to purify the heart through obedience; and, consequently, to bestow the joy unspeakable and full of glory, that prelude of eternal bliss which was the earnest enjoyed by all who sincerely believed and obeyed the ancient gospel. In examining the diseased body of Christ.

now called his church, we discover that the malady is in the heart. From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, it is true, there are wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores. But in one word, the new gospels, falsely called gospels, fail in this, that *they cannot purify the heart*, because they are all destitute of an institution which gives a formal, sensible, and perfect remission of sins. The forgiveness which they promise is obscure and uncertain, because dependent on inference. While a person is not assured that his sins are pardoned, it is impossible to cherish full confidence in God, to have full peace of conscience, and consequently to be filled with joy, which is another name for happiness. No such assurance is the product of the Calvinian or Arminian gospels. They want an assurance of remission. They teach their votaries to write out of what passes in their own mind a receipt, or to make out a release from their sins, from the workings of their own minds. This being a train of inferential reasonings, is wholly destitute of that impetus which gave the first converts such assurance of the favor of God. The moderns necessarily walk by sense, by feeling, and not by faith in God's promise, and are subject to all the misgivings and doubts of which they talk, and love to complain, as signs and proofs of their conversion.

The *testimony of God*, and not an *inference*, was the ground of assurance in which the ancient christians triumphed before God. If they had been interrogated on the subject of their acceptance with God—if they had been asked what assurance they had that they were adopted into the family of God, or had their sins remitted—they would have replied, We were immersed by the authority of the Lord Jesus and into his name for this very purpose. We know that we believed, confessed, and were immersed, and therefore we have the testimony of God that we are saved. The Calvinian and Arminian gospels permit them who believe them only to say, 'We hope we *shall be pardoned*, or *are pardoned*, because we once felt thus and so, and afterwards felt so and thus. We concluded upon the whole that we were born again; and, therefore, *we think* we have the forgiveness of our sins. Such an inference from such premises is neither the wisdom nor the power of God to salvation. It is too weak to elevate the mind towards God and heaven.

Most men are too imperfect philosophers to discriminate between the soul and spirit—to discriminate between the intellectual powers and affections and passions;—they have not been trained nor practised in mental philosophy; and, therefore, to make the ground of assurance rest upon such attainments, is not according to the wisdom of God. Most men are imperfect reasoners upon external and sensible objects; how much more imperfect when the mind and the heart are the objects upon which they are to reason; and when mental acts and impressions are the premises from which they are to draw conclusions deeply affecting their present and future happiness. Can such a scheme be called the *wisdom* of God! And that it is not the *power* of God, we have only to observe how ineffectual the scheme is to reform and console those indoctrinated into it. The novice is more happy

than those fully initiated. The greater the adept, the less happy the man. Hence the farther they penetrate the system, the more doubtful, pensive, and sorrowful they become, and how often do they recur to their first days as their best days.

To mould the gospel into the form of a command, and to make that command a *positive* and not a moral precept, heightens the favor, or makes grace more gracious; because it enables every man sensibly to feel, or realize the pardon of his sins, and to remember the time and place in which he was justified and born into the family of God. The more formal and significant the act of obedience required in the command, the better adapted to give the pledge and assurance desired. Hence the command concerning remission is one which cannot be obeyed by an act of the spirit, or soul, or body of man apart, but by an act of the whole man. His understanding, will, affections, his whole person is engaged in the act. A very humble bow of the whole man to the authority of the Lord must be made at the threshold of the kingdom of Jesus—a bow which requires the concurrence of body, soul, and spirit; and in such a posture, and in such circumstances, as to make it the most memorable act of a person's life. It is a death, burial, and resurrection. Hence he who obeys the gospel is not only conscious of the act in his mind—he not only sensibly recognizes himself obeying, but has it so impressed upon his memory that he can scarcely ever forget that he has been purged from his old sins. This is that impression which releases the conscience from guilt, begets peace of mind, and rejoices the heart. The ancient gospel, then, is the power of God as well as his wisdom. It does that for those who obey it, which no system now taught can do.

[Here brother *James Mason*, of Montgomery county, related his experience, illustrative of the assurance which he had that his sins were remitted before he was immersed. Brother *Fishback* also related his experience confirmatory. I also narrated mine. After we all had told over our experience, in which there appeared a considerable similarity, having been all, according to the laws of orthodoxy, moulded in the Calvinian school; I proceeded to make some remarks upon *impressions* in general, and religious impressions in particular. The purport of these remarks was to show that imaginary good and evil, for the time being, operated like realities. On this principle we explained the momentary peace and joy of those who had received "*the token for good*," "*heard the voice of pardon*," or felt some unprecedented glow, some peculiar warmth of affection arising from some text, or dream, or impulse. We then narrated, in substance, the following case:]—

A young gentleman, a student in one of our seminaries, while in the ardor of his academic pursuits, one day, while sitting at his books, was deeply impressed, as if he heard a voice from heaven, saying, that on Friday eight days, (if I remember right,) at three o'clock, P. M. he would certainly die. He arose from the table, shut his books, and walked the room greatly agitated. He communicated his convictions of the truth of this impression, first to his room-mate, and he commu-

nicated it to his Preceptor, and then to the Faculty of the College. They all, in turn, conversed with him; but in vain. None of them could succeed in removing the impression. He persisted in affirming that he was indubitably certain of dissolution at the hour mentioned, and that the impression was ever vivid, and could not be misinterpreted. The Faculty wrote to his relatives. They arrived, perhaps, on the third day previous. They reasoned, remonstrated, and expostulated, without effect. He had by this time refused to eat, and began to decline in appearance. They called a consultation of physicians. They concurred in opinion that if he could not be made to sleep over Friday, that in all probability he would expire. It was with difficulty they deluded him to swallow a portion of laudanum. It had the desired effect. He slept from Thursday night till Saturday morning. Awaking at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning, and ascertaining the hour, supposing it to be Friday, he said, "Now I have just five hours to live." "Were you not to die on *Friday?*" said an acquaintance in the room. "Yes," he rejoined, "and is not this Friday?" "No," said his friend, "this is *Saturday.*" "Impose not upon me thus," he replied; "did I not retire last night to rest at the usual hour, and was it not Thursday?" "You slept all day on Friday," was the reply. Several persons were called in and interrogated; and it was not till some persons supposed to be disinterested were called in and affirmed that it was Saturday morning, that he yielded the point. Finding his impression to have deceived him, he arose, washed his face, ate his breakfast, and on the Monday following resumed his studies. I recollect not the Magazine in which I read this narrative, but I have no doubt that it is substantially correct; and, with many similar cases, of which, doubtless, we have all read or heard, goes to show how easily we may be deluded by impressions; and also to prove that imaginary facts will operate as real ones. The testimony of God, sealed and attested as it is, is the only safe foundation on which a rational mind can rely in any of these great concerns pertaining to life everlasting.

It is truly astonishing that God should have been at so much pains to establish his testimony on this subject of remission, and that men should lay so little stress upon his veracity. Paul says he confirmed his promise of blessing all nations IN Christ with an oath. That by *two immutable things*, in which it is impossible to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us. God's oath and promise are given us that when we put ourselves *under Christ*, or submit to his government, he will bless us. To you first, says Peter to the Jews, God having raised up his Son, has sent him to bless you, every one of you, turning from his iniquities. To turn from our iniquities, and to come to Jesus, and to be in him, are expressions indicative of that change confessed when we put on Christ in immersion.

Our greatest objection to the popular gospels of the sects is this, that they fail to give this assurance; consequently, to pacify the conscience, to purify the heart, and to give that strong impulse to the mind which enables it to overcome the world.

Dr. Fishback.—But does the proposed reformation contemplate only a change in the views of christians on the meaning of baptism, or the import of the gospel preached by the Apostles?

Reply.—No: this is only preliminary to that reformation of life indispensable to the happiness of mankind. The ancient gospel must be understood and cordially embraced as a foundation for that reformation unto life which christianity proposes. It is designed to place men under the government of Jesus Christ which is another name for the reign of heaven. The whole christian institution is necessary to that perfection of character and of bliss which the Saviour promised his disciples. No person can enjoy the influences of a government under which he does not live. We must live in the kingdom or under the government of Jesus Christ, if we would enjoy the blessings of his reign. Hence the ancient order of things is as necessary to the happiness of the disciples as the ancient gospel, to bring men into the only kingdom of Jesus which exists upon earth. No man who has a guilty conscience can enter that kingdom. It is the reign of righteousness, peace, and joy. and these are within men. Hence regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit introduce men into this relation to God.

In the kingdom of Jesus all the citizens are made kings and priests to God; all are adopted into the rank of children, and all sit in heavenly places under Christ. The Lord's day is sacred to the Lord's people; the Lord's table is always found in the Lord's house; and the Lord's supper is the feast of the citizens of the reign of heaven. The reformation we plead proposes nothing short of an unconditional and unreserved submission to Jesus as prophet, priest, and king. The constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, and customs of the kingdom he has founded, must be regarded by every citizen, avouching him to be Lord, before he can walk with God, dwell in love, and rejoice in the hope of immortality, as did those who first trusted in him as the Saviour of the world.

Instead of a congregation attending on the Lord's day to the lectures or comments of a licensed talker, who frequently converts his mystic effusions into the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, we would reform them into worshipping assemblies, and have them to spend the day to the Lord, not in listening to his opinions, but in doing the things which the Lord commanded. Were the disciples thus to meet every week in honor of the Lord's resurrection, and spend the time in hearing the Apostles speak the Oracles of God, in singing the lofty praises of the immortal King, in invoking the name of the Lord, in commemorating his death, in contributing to the necessities of saints, in exciting one another to love and good works, we should soon find a radical change in the knowledge and manners of the disciples, and they would find a joy and a consolation in Christ of which the reigning systems know nothing.

That great teacher, *Experience*, has confirmed these remarks. We know experimentally both systems. We have sat under the voice of a monotonous or rhapsodic spiritualizer, and we have enjoyed the in-

stitutions of the Lord's house. We have found our experience to correspond not only with that of others, but with the anticipations which reason suggested from an examination of the genius of the institution.

The whole christian institution is a reforming system. It begins with sinners and ends with saints. It supposes all the imperfections of our nature and habits, and is designed to purify, elevate, and refine our minds and manners. It is as wisely adapted to this object as the particles of light to the eye, or as the eye to the light. But it must be submitted to. The institutions of any sect are necessary to form sectarians of that class which adopts them. Those of the Great Teacher are all necessary to form genuine christians.

A reformation of opinions, or the substitution of one human establishment in the place of another, has often been attempted and achieved. But as the stream can rise no higher than the fountain, those systems which began in the flesh have ended in the flesh. Improved and new-modified sectarians have been the only achievements of the most reformed human institutions. Christianity came from God and it leads to God. It is divine, and it makes us partakers of a divine nature. Any system which does not teach a man to live soberly, righteously, and godly, is not of God, and is worth nothing in the affair of salvation. In a word, we only desire to see the Apostles enthroned in the hearts of the disciples, and to see them blameless observers of the Lord's commandments. Those who have made it their interest to honor Luther, Calvin, Wesley, or Fuller, may be induced to oppose us, supposing that these reformers have honored the Apostles; but let them represent our views as they may, such is the design, and such, we think, is the direct tendency of the reformation for which we plead.

[There was much said on these topics, too long to tell; but such were the outlines defined; to all of which our friend the Doctor, with all present who expressed themselves, seemed cordially to yield assent. On the question whether immersion for remission of sins was preached to the Gentiles, some doubt was expressed by brother Fishback; but as respected the Jews, there was no difficulty. These doubts appeared to yield to a variety of consideration and argument submitted, and especially to the fact that Paul has decided that there is but *one immersion*, and that the God of the Jews is the God of the Gentiles also; and that both people were immersed into one body and into one spirit in putting on the Messiah.] EDITOR.

Mulberry Grove, near Nashville, Ten. Dec. 10, 1830.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

NO. V.

FROM Lexington we proceeded to Athens. A large and attentive audience were addressed in that place on the subject of the present apostacy. Paul's prophecy in his 2d letter to the Thessalonians, and that of John in the 17th and 18th chapters of the Revelation, were read with a view to mark the prominent characteristics of the mystery of iniquity. The rise, progress, and present state of the apostacy,

were briefly noticed. Considerable emphasis was laid upon the frontispiece of the Mother of Harlots, mounted upon a monstrous beast, having seven heads and ten horns. The topmost word upon her forehead next arrested our attention. The large capitals upon her tiara, which spell MYSTERY, were shown to be not only the first in place, but in importance, in discriminating this Babylonish *mistress* from all the paramours of the kings of the earth. The mystic doctrines and mysterious meanings ascribed to the apostolic writings, were shown to be the instrument by which this woman mounted the seven-headed and ten-horned beast; in other words, the means by which Antichrist first gained the ascendant, and by which *Babylon the Great* was reared.

The Protestant reformation was shown to be more political than religious, and to have issued in giving to christendom many Protestant Popes for one Catholic Pope. The well-meant efforts of Luther were shown to have been frustrated in part by the friends of reformation and the schemes of statesmen: and that though he gave the people a new version of the Scriptures, and exhorted them to read them, still the rules of interpreting and quoting them by the papistical doctors were substantially adopted by the friends and coadjutors of Martin; and thus his reformation eventuated in the mere change of creeds and masters, as England and Scotland unequivocally demonstrate.

The Augsburg Confession, though accidentally made an authoritative creed, was shown to have been made the platform of a politico-ecclesiastic establishment, as fleshly, sensual, and, for its opportunity, as bloody as that of the mother whose daughter it was. The Wesleyan reformation of Protestant Episcopacy was shown to be only the daughter of the daughter of the old Queen who boasted that she was not yet a widow. Wesley and Fletcher had reformed the doctrines and discipline of episcopacy, it was admitted; but their efforts ended in a *five-headed* priesthood. Metropolitan Bishops and Archbishops, with swords by their sides, were discarded: but diocesan prelates, presiding elders, circuit riders, local preachers, and class leaders, with the discipline and conferences, local and general, had not done much more for heaven or earth than the German Reformer had done for King Harry and his worthy realm of England.

The times in which we live prove louder than argument that all these reformations issue in a state of society very unlike that which christianity contemplates. We have only to notice the fruits of these systems, to be assured that the tree is not that planted by the Great Husbandman. The word of God is virtually made of non-effect by these sectarian dogmas and traditions.

From these remarks we passed on to the ancient gospel and order of things; and after an exhortation to reformation, three persons confessed the Lord and were immersed by brother G. Boon for the remission of their sins.

After partaking of the hospitalities of Major Shelby, on Tuesday morning we went on to Nicholasville. A congregation, as usual,

larger than could find ingress into the meeting-house, were in waiting. We addressed them from the 11th chapter of the Hebrews. The faith of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, the 12,000,000 adults who walked through the Red Sea, of Rahab, and the army which encompassed Jericho, was considered and shown to be a belief of God's promises made to these individuals, and that not merely the principle of faith, but *the acts proceeding from it*, gave reputation to all this cloud of witnesses.

The faith of Abraham was particularized, and an exhortation to become the children of Abraham by believing God's promise of remission now proclaimed in the apostolic gospel, and the obedience of the command to submit to Jesus, was followed by the confession of three persons, who, willing to glorify God by relying upon his power and faithfulness, and by being buried with Jesus in immersion, were introduced into the kingdom of Jesus by brother J. Hewit.

After dining with brother Shrieve, we proceeded to Mr. L——'s to spend the night. A considerable part of the night was occupied in writing; and after an early breakfast we went on our way, having to cross the Kentucky river, and to drive 14 miles to meet the appointment in Harrodsburg.

At Harrodsburg we found the meeting house belonging to the town so crowded as with difficulty to gain admission. We addressed them on the 4th chapter of the letter to the Ephesians. After speaking of the one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one hope, one God, in order to enforce the one immersion, we gave them a lecture embracing the following items, called

THE SEVEN BAPTISMS.

Adding to the baptisms found in the Book of God, those invented by men and practised in this country, we can count at least *seven*. We allude not to the obsolete discussions about the "subject and mode," or about the *action* and *subject:* but to the meaning or doctrine of immersion. The act of immersion is the same act, whether man, woman, or child—cup, table, or couch, be the subject of the act. It is not the meaning of sprinkling, pouring, or dipping; but the meaning of those institutions, human and divine, called *baptisms*, to which we solicit attention. And that we may keep the one immersion supremely and distinctly in view, we shall commence with those baptisms of human invention; and first with

INFANT BAPTISM.

For the sake of brevity we call it "*infant baptism*," whether it be infant sprinkling or infant immersion. That we may understand the meaning and design of infant baptism, we shall read the definition of baptism given in the Presbyterian Confession which prescribes it:—

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized in the visible church; but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world."

Infants are said, by the authors of this definition, to be chargeable only with "*original sin*," which is always spoken of in the singular number. If, then, according to the creed, infants have only "original sin," how can infant baptism be a sign and seal of remission of *sins*, in the plural number! It is impossible, unless they are considered as guilty of actual transgressions. The creed, then, must be in an error. Either infants are chargeable with more than original sin, or baptism is not to them a sign and seal of remission of sins. This difficulty we hope the Paidobaptists will explain. Some may, perhaps, think that baptism, as defined in the creed, respects adults only. If so, baptism is, with them, of two sorts—one for infants and one for adults. They, then, teach *two* baptisms—one for sinners, and one for them who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

If baptism be to infants a "sign and seal of regeneration, of engrafting into Christ, and of giving themselves up to him;" then, indeed, all the children of the flesh, all the baptized youths of the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Methodist sects, are regenerated, engrafted into Christ, and in the New Covenant. But this they do not themselves believe; and, therefore, their own creed is, themselves being judges, incredible. Infant baptism, then, is a baptism without meaning, and without a blessing. It is a mere ceremony, the sign and seal of nothing to the child, save that its father or its godfather had too much faith in water.

QUAKER BAPTISM.

This is a spiritual baptism which cannot be explained; but is said to import that light which is communicated to every Quaker by some spirit which they are pleased to call the *Holy Spirit*. It is a mystic baptism, unreasonably and unscripturally called "the baptism of the Holy Spirit." Of this in its own place.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

This was an institution from Heaven. It was expressly for reformation and forgiveness of sins. Such remission of sins as was enjoyed under the economy of Moses was granted to the reforming Jews, who confessed their sins and were immersed into the faith that the Messiah was soon to appear, or that the reign of God was approaching. John immersed men that they might reform He immersed not by the authority of the Lord Jesus, but by the authority of the Heavenly Father. He required no person to believe that Jesus was the Messiah. He immersed into no name. He only prepared a people for the Lord.

THE BAPTISM IN FIRE.

Malachi promised this to the impenitent and unbelieving. When he promised Elijah or John the Baptist and the coming of Jesus, he declared and foretold the baptism in fire. "Behold," said he, "the day comes that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, and all who do wickedly shall be as stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, and it shall leave them neither root nor branch." "Behold," says Jehovah, "I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of that great and terrible day of the Lord." This terrible day of the

Lord is called by the Elijah that was to come "the impending vengeance," or "the wrath to come." The history of Jesus opens with the annunciation of this terrible baptism. All Judea and Jerusalem were affrighted. Sadducees and Pharisees united in their regard for John, and in solicitude to obtain the benefits of his immersion in water. John accosted them as Malachi foretold. To these applicants he proclaimed reformation, and informed them that he, whose approaching reign he announced, would immerse them in the Holy Spirit and in fire; indicating, as the explanation appended showed, that some of them would be immersed in the Holy Spirit, and some of them in fire: for Jesus was able to make a discrimination which John presumed not to do. "His winnowing shovel is in his hand; and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor." He will collect his wheat into his granary when the chaff is separated; but the chaff he will immerse or consume *in unquenchable fire* The day of discrimination is at hand. The axe lies at the root of the tree. Every tree which brings not forth good fruit shall be felled and *converted into fuel.* The dry and dead trees, and the chaff, or, as Malachi said, "the stubble," shall be burned up in this tremendous immersion.

Some of the scribes and teachers of this day are praying to be immersed in fire. They suppose that because tongues, *resembling fire*, were the accompaniments of the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, that the baptism in fire must be a blessing. Singular perversion of reason and of the words of John! How could tongues resembling fire be a real baptism in fire! How could a blessing be proclaimed as a threat! Can the subjects of an immersion in the Spirit, be compared to stubble, to dry and rotten wood, or to chaff? Persons resembling stubble, dry trees, and chaff, are the only proper subjects of an immersion in fire. And how can any one, not deluded by mysticism, imagine that any thing in the form of a blessing could be compared to fire operating on a human body! Is not fire operating on the bodies of men always the symbol of punishment. To be immersed in a lake of fire is the strongest figure of the severity of that vengeance which will be the lot of the impenitent and unbelieving. Fire as an emblem of purification is only applied to metals. He will be as the refiner's fire to consume the dross among the sons of Levi—as the fuller's soap to wash away the filth. Persecutions may be compared to a fire. And those who are tried severely may be said to have sustained a "fiery trial;" but how any one can suppose that the righteous can be compared to chaff and stubble, and as such be immersed in fire as a blessing to them, requires a genius thrice baptized into the gnostic faith to comprehend.

John was the only preacher who preached the baptism in fire: he proclaimed the fates of those who would submit to the new government, and the fates of those who would not kiss the Son. He intimated to all his hearers the power, mental, moral, judicial, the divine power of him whose coming reign he announced. The Apostles of Jesus taught not merely the wrath to come on the unbelieving Jews in the year of vengeance, but also the everlasting destruction of those

who know not God and obey not the gospel of his Son. The vengeance of an eternal fire they proclaim to those who reject the great salvation; and still it is true, that those who submit not to the authority of the Lord, who wilfully reject the one immersion, must be immersed in fire, in the figurative import of these words. So that the preachers of righteousness may yet say water or fire, pardon or punishment, life or death: for he that believes and is immersed shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be condemned.

BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.

This was promised by John and by Jesus. John affirmed that Jesus would immerse his disciples in the Holy Spirit. This was also, like the *immersion in fire*, promised by the Jewish Prophets. Joel foretold these days. A stupendous display of heavenly influences, like which there had not been one vouchsafed to mortal man since time was born, distinguished this immersion. The time fixed for it was the birth day of the christian age—the commencement of the reign of Messiah in heaven. Jesus informed his disciples that this baptism of which John spoke would be vouchsafed to them not many days after he left them. Soon as he was exalted "a Prince and a Saviour to bestow reformation and forgiveness of sins upon Israel," upon all who would submit to his government, he shed forth those supernal influences, all the gifts of the Holy Spirit, under the direction of which the Apostles were placed. Their hearts burned within them in all holy raptures; their understandings were light shining from the Sun of Righteousness; their tongues, moved by the impulses of the Eternal Spirit, uttered the wonders of heaven; their faces glowed with the beauty of holiness; and their whole persons were adorned by the bright shining emblems of the power and presence of the Spirit of wisdom and of utterance. They spake in every tongue the wonderful works of God. Such was the immersion in the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus. From him it came; and to assert his new glories in heaven, as well as to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, it was bestowed. No men were ever more fully immersed, or buried in water, than were these men hid and immersed in the Holy Spirit. It was not Peter *the fisherman*, but Peter *the Apostle of Jesus*, covered and filled with the Spirit of God, who was seen and heard. Overwhelmed they were with these powers of the world to come. Their understandings, wills, affections—their bodies, souls, and spirits, were submitted to, and submerged in, the energies of him who proceeded from the Father and the Son.

In the admission of the Gentiles into the kingdom; in the conversion of Cornelius, his family, and friends, this immersion was repeated. Peter, in the 11th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, applies the same promise of the immersion in the Holy Spirit to what had happened in this house. Thus Jews and Gentiles were all immersed in the same Holy Spirit; and God received them both into his family with the same marks of his affection, and with the same demonstrations of benignity, irrespective of any former national distinctions. Indeed, like the father of the prodigal son, he went out to meet the

returning Gentiles, and fell upon them and embraced them before they came into his house. Thus the Gentiles received the gifts of the Holy Spirit before they were immersed into the name of the Holy Spirit. Such is the scriptural import of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

That the Quaker notion of an internal influence, or of an invisible communication of some spiritual light to the mind, is not the baptism of the Holy Spirit, will appear apparent, if not from what has been already said, from a fact so palpable that we see not how it can be evaded. It is this: The persons to whom Jesus promised the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts i.) were possessed, for years before that time, of more gifts and communications of the Spirit, than any persons now living, or who have since lived. If, then, persons who had received the Spirit, as had the Apostles at the time of their first mission, who had spoken by it, healed diseases, cleansed lepers, raised the dead, cast out demons, and whose tempers were influenced by it, had not till Pentecost been immersed in the Holy Spirit; shall we say that any Quaker, with all the gifts he supposes himself possessed, has been immersed in the Holy Spirit?

METAPHORICAL BAPTISM.

Almost every prominent word in language has a metaphorical as well as a literal import. Hence we have a metaphorical immersion. I have, says Jesus, referring to his anticipated sufferings, an immersion to undergo, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished? Can you, said he, to the sons of Zebedee, submit to the immersion which I have to suffer? What, says Paul, shall they do who are immersed for the dead? Why jeopardize our lives—why subject ourselves to many sufferings, if the dead rise not? To be overwhelmed in sorrow; to pass through the deep waters of affliction; to be encompassed with tribulation, is to be immersed in this acceptation of the term.

THE ONE IMMERSION, OR CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

This is the immersion for the remission of sins, proclaimed by the Apostles, on, and from, Pentecost, to the close of the volume. Concerning this immersion so much has already been said, we enlarge not here. The confessions of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodistic and Baptist sects were read on this article; and it was shown that with more or less clearness this baptism is asserted in the creeds, though not practised by the people.

A non-descript baptism is likely to arise out of the present controversy. The sects are likely to renounce their creed baptism, and in their opposition to the christian, or the one immersion, they will be constrained to explain baptism into a mere form or ceremony of induction into a sect; having no blessing or promise associated with it. Some of them are almost mute already on the meaning of immersion; and ere long baptism will likely be taught as a duty to be performed as we pay our taxes for the sake of the government.

Narrative Continued.

After the discourse was ended in Harrodsburg, we retired to brother Williams', where we spent the evening very happily in conversation

with many disciples and fellow-citizens. From Harrodsburg, on the next day, 25th November, we went to brother John Bowman's, eight miles distant from Danville, where I continued till Saturday morning. Fatigued with much talking, I spent a part of two days in writing the essays dated from Danville Danville being called the seat of the clerical kingdom in Kentucky, or of the Presbyterian College and heads of departments, we resolved to spend two days in proclaiming the reformation in that place. Brother Jacob Creath, Jun. delivered a discourse on Friday in the Baptist meeting house, introductory to the course intended. On Saturday we gave them a lecture on the nature of obedience, drawn from Samuel's address to Saul concerning the discharge of the injunctions respecting the Amalekites, and from Paul's remarks in the second chapter of the letter to the Romans.

On the Lord's day we lectured on the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, from the eighth chapter of the letter to the Hebrews. The topics were,

1. The nature and use of constitutions in general.

2. That God had, in every age of the world, placed man under some constitutional arrangement.

2. That these economies, or arrangements, were a guarantee to those under them of the extent and continuance of all stipulated privileges.

4. The constitutional or fundamental provisions of the christian economy.

5. An exhortation to surrender to the constitution and government of the King of Saints.

Great attention was paid, not only by those in the house, but by many who stood out of doors, although it rained during the whole discourse. Many individuals appeared much affected. Ten males and one female came forward to confess the Lord, among whom was my friend Gen. William Jennings, of Lancaster, Garrard county. One was called home through indisposition before we reached the pool at the residence of brother Dounton. Brother Jacob Creath, Jun. immersed ten into the Lord Jesus in the presence of many witnesses. The disciples met in the evening to break bread: and, after singing several spiritual songs, we separated, much refreshed and comforted in the Lord.

We spent the Lord's day night with brother Dounton, and in the morning returned to the residence of Dr. J. Ayres, whose hospitality we had before enjoyed. There we bade adieu to several brethren who had accompanied us for many days, among whom were Jacob Creath, Sen. and Josephus Hewit. Brethren Bullock and Jesse, from Woodford; brother P. Higbie, from Fayette; and brother Kercheval, from Mason, who had accompanied us for many days, separated from us after the immersion the preceding evening.

Brother Ephraim A. Smith, with whom, at the residence of his father, we breakfasted, on Monday morning being prevented by more controlling considerations from accompanying me to Nashville, and brother Jacob Creath, Jun. proposing to accompany me thither, we

started for Columbia, Adair county, where we arrived on the evening of the 30th November. Brother Smith accompanied us to the residence of Col. Coffee, where we stopped during the night of the 29th. Without any appointment on our part, a congregation, which filled the house, having assembled, brother Creath spoke to them on faith and reformation.

In Columbia we enjoyed the hospitalities of James Caldwell, Esq. and had an agreeable interview with brother John Steel and J. D. Jourdan of Tennessee, who labor in the word and doctrine. Brother Steele had the honor of being rejected by the Association to which he had once belonged, because he preferred Paul to Andrew Fuller, and Jesus Christ to Dr. John Gill. We spoke on the 1st of December to the citizens of Columbia and the vicinity, from the 10th chapter of the Acts. But not one of them had faith and courage to confess the Lord. Brother Steele, in some vicinities of this town, has immersed some scores of disciples during the last year for the remission of their sins. On the 2d instant we departed for Glasgow; narrowly escaped several dangers on the way. It rained and blew so violently, that it was with much difficulty we reached Glasgow at the time appointed. Trees and branches of trees fell frequently before and behind us. It appeared at different times that we were saved by being a minute too late—at other places, by being a minute too soon for the descending limbs and trunks of the forest.

"How are thy servants bless'd, O Lord!
How sure is their defence!
Eternal Wisdom is their guide;
Their help Omnipotence."

At Glasgow we sojourned with brethren Trabue and Logan. The citizens were not apprized of our arrival until a few hours before we appeared. The appointment was delayed by some irregularity in the mail. We addressed them on the conversion of the Eunuch. At night we had a conversation meeting.

Brethren John Davis, formerly a Cumberland Presbyterian preacher, and S. Bagby, once a Regular Baptist, are able and successful proclaimers of the ancient gospel in the county of Barren. We had the pleasure of an interview with them in Glasgow.

From Glasgow we proceeded to Bowling Green; tarried from Saturday till Monday morning with brother Muirhead. Spoke on the Lord's day on the connexion between intelligence, purity, and happiness. The intelligence communicated in the Holy Scriptures was shown to be limited by one great line of discrimination. Every thing, not directly nor indirectly conducive to purity, was excluded; and all discussions and developements addressed to human curiosity, not having a moral tendency, were purposely omitted. The nature of that purity was exhibited, without which no man shall see the Lord. The inefficiency of modern gospels, sermons, and institutions to promote that elevated christian purity, contemplated by the great author of christianity, was demonstrated. The ancient gospel, as detailed by Peter in different places in the Acts of Apostles was exhibited

Two persons came forward to confess the Lord. One was an old gentleman who had been a Presbyterian, and who entered the house, as he informed me, filled with prejudices against myself and the cause which I plead. The evening being tempestuous, and the river at some distance, he was not immersed till the next morning at sunrise. Thence we departed for Nashville, sixty miles distant, where we arrived on the evening of the 7th instant.

EDITOR.

Columbia, Ten. December 18, 1830.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

AFTER attempting to determine the instrument of religious instruction, which God has commanded us to use, and the manner of using it which he has prescribed, the next question which demands our consideration, is, Into whose hands has he committed its use? To this question I reply, without a moment's hesitation, Into the hands of his saints, without discrimination or exception: and for the truth of this assertion I appeal in particular to Daniel vii. 18. 22. 27. Ephes. iv. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 2.

1. From Daniel vii. 23, 24, 25, 26, it appears, that after the Roman empire should be broken into ten parts, a power should arise, hostile in the extreme to the friends and followers of Jesus Christ, a power that should continue to display its hostility successfully, till the Ancient of days should come, and cause justice to be done to his saints, even at the time appointed for putting them in possession of their kingdom.

2. From this famous prediction it appears also certain, that for a great length of time the saints should be reduced to a state of severe vassalage, should be completely trampled under the feet of men, who should pretend to be christians and not infidels; from whose tyranny and subjection, however, they should at last be delivered by the interposition of the person called the Ancient of days, and become in their own persons the administrators, conductors, or managers of their own affairs, that being the only sense in which the expression "possess or take the kingdom" can be understood: for in the capacity of subjects and slaves the saints have always been constituent parts of the kingkom; but surely while living in the condition of slaves they could not be said to *possess* the kingdom, that necessarily implying the administration of its affairs.

3. From the death of the twelve men whom Christ miraculously qualified, and exclusively employed to organize his kingdom, and during their lives to govern it according to laws which he caused to be reduced to writing, and thus rendered visible, permanent, and transmissible to all parts of the earth for its government after their decease, a few men, who assumed the title of clergy, or God's lot, and not the saints, have, down to the present day, possessed, or rather usurped the kingdom ultimately intended for the saints; for they have claimed exclusively the management of Christ's affairs, and exercised an unlimited jurisdiction over his subjects; some in one form and some

in another: some by the irresistible mandates of the spiritual potentates, called Bishops, and their servile dependents; some by the equally imperious and tyrannical decrees of mongrel courts, (courts which both legislate and judge,) called assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and sessions; others by the no less iniquitous and oppressive resolutions of conferences and associations, &c. each clerical group prescribing, with arbitrary power, such dogmas of doctrine, formulas of worship, terms of communion, punishment of offences, real or imaginary, as best pleased their fancy, gratified their humor, or served their interest.

4. But when the saints shall obtain their kingdom, and get the management of their affairs into their own hands, as there will be no pretension to legislative power or magisterial authority among them, every part of their doctrine will consist in the unmixed and unerring declarations of the God of truth, and every part of their religious and moral conduct will be conformed to the existing laws of their spiritual sovereign, Jesus Christ; for they will then acknowledge none else: no, however long other *lords* may have had dominion over them, the saints will then reject their sway, and bow their heads, their hearts, and all they have, to Christ alone. There will then exist among the people of God no religious dogmas, devised and taught by uninspired men; no act will be offered to God as an act of worship, which he has not commanded; none left unperformed which he has enjoined; no dissentions to exasperate, no schisms to disunite his friends; no immoralities to deform, disgrace, and impede the lovely cause of Christ; nor religious demagogus to wrangle and contend for the augmentation of their respective factions. Then, and not before, will uncorrupted truth, righteousness, peace, and pure worship, adorn and bless our world; because then, and not before, will the men who have so long lorded it over the understandings, consciences, affections and property of their fellow-men, be stript, entirely stript of all their influence and all their power. No longer shall they be able to act the part of religious demagogues [see 2 Peter ii. 1, 2, 3,] and crowd their sectarian standards with millions of ignorant, thoughtless, deluded devotees, all eager to believe whatever they may choose to tell them. No longer shall they be able to mould, fashion, and regulate the consciences of men, inducing them to regard as criminal and opprobrious whatever they affect to condemn, and as innocent and laudable whatever they licence or approve. Nor shall they, by fair speeches, flattering condescensions, and fervent professions of deep and peculiar interest in human happiness, be able to inveigle the affections of credulous mortals. No, nor shall they be able to extort their annual millions from an oppressed or deceived multitude. Behold Europe, which for many generations has paid upwards of ninety millions annually to its clergy, for the *amazing purpose* of removing from God's message the *obstinate*, the *irremovable* darkness, which he (if we may believe the clergy) has spread over it.

5. But this prediction also assures us, that every one of the saints, and every one of them alike, and not a few of the more impudent and

assuming, should possess the kingdom, or have the conducting of its affairs in their own hands: for the Spirit, who revealed this matter to the Prophet, makes no distinction, no exception; but declares that the privileges and duties of the saints, when they should be raised to the government of Christ's terrestrial kingdom, should be all alike.

6. With the prediction of the Prophet, the declaration of the Apostle, Eph. iv. 12. exactly corresponds. In the preceding verse we are told by the inspiring Spirit, that Christ, on his ascension, gave to his infant community five classes of gifted or inspired instructers, distinguished from one another, not only by their respective titles and occupations, but also by the gifts by which they were infallibly qualified for the performance of their respective functions. And in verse 12th the same inspiring Spirit informs us of the end, purpose, or object, for the accomplishment of which, the extraordinary endowments just mentioned were bestowed; namely, for the purpose of qualifying or putting the saints or uninspired believers in a condition to perform the work called *diakonia*, the service or edification of the body of Christ. In whatever actions, then, this work, called the service, consists, or the building up of the body of Christ requires, these actions are here manifestly not only entrusted to, and expressly devolved on, but restricted to the persons here called the saints. So explicitly declared is this fact in this important passage, that no mind which has the least respect for divine authority, for the will and veracity of God, will venture to deny or evade it.

7. It being, then, reduced to all the certainty to which the explicit declaration of a God, who cannot lie, can reduce it, that the performance of every action contained in Christ's service, or requisite to the building up of his body, is indiscriminately committed to, or rather devolved on, the persons called the saints; two questions of vast importance present themselves, Who are the saints? and, What their qualifications to execute the trust confided to them? Are none saints but the few aspiring men who falsely and ridiculously pretend to have heard a divine call, (a call, by the by, which never sounded in their ears, which only thrilled through and tickled their vain deluded imagination,) and boast the reception of a rotten, imaginary, delusive authority; an authority imparted from men, who never had a particle of such authority either to keep or to transfer? *Credat Judæus, non ego.* This would stagger the belief of a Jew. It is manifest that in the New Testament all are denominated saints who profess to believe on Jesus Christ, and act agreeably to their profession; all who sincerely love and punctually obey their Redeemer; all who are in reality his friends: and it is equally plain, that to them, as believing and faithful subjects, has the management of his affairs on earth been hitherto entrusted, and will continue to be entrusted through all succeeding generations, to the last hour of time. 2 Tim. ii. 2.

8. We cannot, then, be at a loss to determine who they are that are called, authorized, and commanded to perform all the actions on whose diligent and faithful performance the building up of the body of Christ, or, in plain English, the diffusion of his religion among mankind, de

pends: every saint, every professed believer, every real friend of the Redeemer, is called, authorized, and commanded to engage daily in his blessed work, and do every act of which it consists. Daily may each of them proclaim in God's own inspired words, to all around, the glorious Deliverer whom a gracious God has sent into our perishing world for its salvation: daily and hourly may he supplicate God publicly, privately, or secretly, for the continuance of his wonted kindness, or the bestowment of new favors, and praise him for his innumerable mercies already conferred: on every first day of the week, or Lord's day may each of them unite with his fellow-believers to consult in a public and social manner God's unerring message, and possess their souls of its invaluable information; join with his religious friends in a public participation of the commemorative action, (now very incorrectly called the Lord's Supper,) and enjoy the sweet pleasure of making a social contribution for the relief of human misery; and when a suitable applicant requests the performance of the initiatory action, to which Christ has commanded all his friends to submit, he may—nay, he ought to perform it on him: and when a professed believer, a member of the usual collection of believers of which he is a member, has erred from God's truth in his sentiments, or deviated in his practice from God's law, he may unite with his fellow-believers both in investigating the fact, and in inflicting the disapprobation which Christ has commanded to be inflicted in the case. He may also, with a christian, a friendly spirit, a benevolent, and affectionate heart, watch over the sentiments and actions of his fellow-believers, and give them in private all necessary and useful counsel, comfort, and reproof. Thus may the saints assemble for their mutual edification every Lord's day, and devote on any day as much of their time to the concerns of their souls as they may judge necessary to secure their eternal happiness.

9. As to the personages now styled *administrators*, scripture is not disposed to acknowledge them. Their title and their office are mere fiction. In the New Testament we are, indeed, informed that Christ's inspired Apostles completely organized his spiritual kingdom, and reduced the laws intended for its perpetual government to writing, that they might furnish direction to all succeeding generations of men. We are there also told, that Paul performed the initiatory action enjoined by his Master on a few persons himself, and that Christ's disciples performed it on others: but by whom this action was performed on the countless number of persons who were converted during the lives of the Apostles from Judaism and Heathenism to Christianity, we are not informed: and to substitute conjecture, or rather mere fancy, for divine information, is a grade of impiety and presumption on which we dare not venture. From all the information which the Holy Spirit has thought fit to communicate to us on this subject, it appears that every person who professes and sustains the character of a disciple, is alike authorized to perform the action in question, when requested by a proper applicant to perform it: for we know that it was performed by disciples; but we do not know that it was ever

performed by any who were not professed disciples, or that it was performed exclusively by any particular description or order of them. For a few, then, of Christ's professed disciples to assume the right of performing it, to the exclusion of the rest, is a manifest usurpation. And as to the commemorative action, which is now commonly called the Supper, who can read its original institution by Christ himself. related in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, or that part of the 11th chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, which records it, and not see, first, that it was in Paul's day performed with no such formalities, pomp, ostentation, and parade, as most denominations now perform it: secondly, that no believer is authorized to interfere with its celebration rather than another: and thirdly, that it is a social action in the performance of which every believer is alike concerned? The command, 'Take, eat, drink,' is equally addressed to all; and the discrimination of participants into givers and receivers, is a discrimination entirely unknown to scripture. and of course entirely unauthorized by it. It appears that the manner of performing this most solemn action, as exhibited in sacred writ, is, that the representing bread and wine be previously procured, made ready, and placed in some convenient situation by one or more of the intending partakers, and at their joint expense; and that they, when the time of participation arrives, all draw near together in succession, and partake, standing, sitting, or kneeling, as disposition may incline, or conveniency may permit, and then withdraw as they approached; thus exhibiting the sympathy, concert, and equality, which the members of a natural body exhibit in their social operations. PHILALETHES.

[*To be continued.*]

LETTER II. TO BISHOP R. B. SEMPLE.

BROTHER SEMPLE,

THAT you should wish your name recorded as opposed to a radical reformation of christian manners, is not more strange than that you should confound the Jewish Law with the Christian Institution. You ask, "What part of the New Testament has declared that the whole of the Old is abrogated except those texts quoted in the New?" Shall I be constrained to remind you that the Old Constitution, or Old Testament, or Old Will of God concerning the Jews, is vacated, abolished, or superseded by the New Constitution? Or must I prove to you that the Gentiles were never under the Jewish Constitution? No: I will rather impute it to the delinquency of your memory than to any imperfection of your judgment. I will, therefore, only aid your recollection by reminding you that a very learned Jew and the Apostle to the Gentiles, has repeatedly decided that the Old Testament, or Constitution, has become "old," or obsolete, has "vanished away," is "abolished," and "disannulled." See his letters to the Corinthians, Hebrews, and Galatians.

But I hope you do not call the writings of Moses and the Prophets *the Old Testament*, or *Constitution*. No sacred writer, no Apostle, no

Jewish, or Christian Prophet, has ever called the whole writings of Moses and the Prophets *the Old Testament*, or *Constitution*. The whole Jewish economy was added to the promise of the Messiah and the inheritance, and therefore its abolition touches neither the Messiah nor his reign. We are gainers by the disannulling of this Old Constitution. "It was contrary to us Gentiles." But Jesus has taken it out of the way. He nailed it to the cross, and has broken down the middle wall of partition. "He has *blotted out* the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us Gentiles;" "having abolished in his flesh the enmity between Jews and Gentiles;—the law of commandments contained in ordinances." I rejoice that the Sinaitic Constitution "*is done away:*" and that from Zion and from Jerusalem the word has come. Able ministers of the New Testament have taught us that while 'the law was given by Moses to the Jews, the favor and the truth came by Jesus.'

Brother Semple, you have taken the mitre from Aaron and the crown from David, and put them on David's Son and David's Lord. Why not, then, give him the rod of Moses? If you will have Moses to legislate for us, deprive us not of the sacerdotal functions of his brother Aaron. If Moses be our lawgiver, Aaron must be our priest, and Saul or David our king. Why do you separate those whom God has joined? I humbly beseech you to tell us the secret.

As a christian I plead for the prophetic fulness, as well as the regal or sacerdotal power and holiness of my Lord. I must honor him whom Moses honored on the Mount, and Elijah too, in the presence of three ministers of the New Testament. If *all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge* are laid up in him—if in him substantially resides *all the fulness* of the Deity—if in him all the promises are yes and amen! (so let it be!) can you err, or can I mistake in fixing the attention and the hearts of all christians upon him, and upon him alone, as Prophet, Priest, and King? Do we need glow-worms at noon? Need we a censer full of incense when a cloud fills the heavens? Need we the blood of a turtle dove when Calvary drank the blood of the Lord? Need we the authority of Moses when all authority in heaven and earth is in our King? Shall we extol the twinklings of stars when the Sun of Mercy, with life-giving beams, shines upon the mental vision of the sons of the kingdom?

Of all the sorceries of the Mystic Woman, who has bewitched the nations, this of acting Jannes and Jambres again is the most subtle and the most enchanting. See how she has made her votaries wear not only bells and pomegranates, but mitres and crowns, by judaizing for them. Neither Martin, nor John of Geneva, nor your friend Andrew, (I mean not Andrew the brother of Peter,) saw this matter clearly. They had drunk too much of her wine ever to be duly sober again.

I could wish that the modern judaizers would notice some facts which seem to have escaped them all. The promise of remission and adoption is anterior to the law; therefore Abraham was justified and accepted *four hundred years*, at least, before the law was given.

The law was added till the seed came, and was enforced on none but the literal descendants of Abraham by Sarah. The Jews were on their way to the inheritance, and had been immersed into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, before a syllable of the law, moral, ceremonial, or judicial, was uttered or written. Our fathers the Gentiles were never under any institution so modern as the Mosaic. The lights which Noah diffused was our lamp till the Messiah began his reign. Cornelius was the first Gentile distinguished by any vision from God since the law was promulged. Till that day "God permitted all nations to walk in their own ways." Then it was that he "granted to the Gentiles a reformation to life." Then he "visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. The land of Canaan was as long and as broad as the obligation of the Mosaic institution. The Prophets looked farther than the law, and uttered oracles reaching through all time and embracing all nations. If we Gentiles recognize any precept of Moses as bearing upon us, it is as the people of Samaria said to the woman of Samaria—We believe not for your testimony, but have heard Jesus ourselves; so we say, Moses, we do homage not for your saying it, but because our Prophet has enjoined it. The acknowledgment of any Prophet but Jesus, is a virtual renunciation or disparagement of them. "Teach them," said he to his ministers, "all these things which *I* have commanded you." Whatever of Moses he has enforced, we regard; what he has not, we read for illustration, not for authority—for our edification, not for our obedience. That we may see what christians lose by not placing Moses in the chair of our teacher, please note the items down, and I will adopt them as a part of the christian institution, if not found in it, and necessarily tending to our happiness.

Kings and Popes have gained crowns and empires by judaizing. The English clergy have made their tithes by this craft; and if the petitions of the Sabbath mail remonstrants are graciously heard by the wise men in Washington, Scotland will not be the only land in which her Kirk will give laws to Cesar. Baptists can gain nothing by this scheme except a smile and a cordial shake of the hand from the orthodox priests of the land. These they have gained already by opposing the present reformation. Why, then, should they plead the cause which Paul opposed in Galatia and in Rome, when they jeopardize only their own system. If the ancient Baptists had a single gem in their crown, it was "*Jesus is our only Prophet.*" And will you, brother Semple, who wrote the history of the Baptists of Virginia—both the living and the dead Baptists—will you, I say, leave it on record that the New Testament, in your opinion, does not contain all the religion of Jesus Christ?

Other matters in your letter call for a few words, which I must promise you for the present, and hope to present in my next.

Believe me ever to be a faithful friend, and yours, in all affection, for the truth's sake.

EDITOR.

LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

LETTER IV.

SIR—

I HAVE read many of the sceptical writings of the present and the past centuries, and some of more remote times; and yet I have to read the first work from the pen of an intelligent opposer of the christian religion. *Intelligent* I need not tell you in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, and in the history of the religious institutions of past ages; and not intelligent in the arts and sciences of peace and war; of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and government, is the acceptation of the term in this appropriation of it. No writer against the Bible, whom I have ever read, appears to have read it with half the attention necessary to understand geometry, astronomy, or even the grammar of a living language. I am sorry to see that you are as superficially acquainted with the book against which you write, as were David Hume, Thomas Paine, and our own Jefferson. None of these have committed a greater blunder than you have done in the following passage from the 17th page:—

"Again, Paul's assertion of the *resurrection* of Jesus is incredible, since he forcibly discredits it by putting it *on a footing with the general resurrection*; and instead of boldly maintaining the fact *upon the strength of the evidence*, like a man conscious of the truth would have done, falls into a hypothetical mode of reasoning, which evinces a begging of the fact. As thus, verse 12, "Now, if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" And, by the by, I will ask you if this does not show a *vestige* of contradiction to facts asserted in the New Testament? But, indeed, if you will allow that the gospels are contemporaneous with themselves, I can show plenty, not only of *vestiges*, but contrary assertions of facts."

"To return, however, to Paul, (13.) "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yes, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised," &c. &c. A triumphant and glorious witness is this to prove that Christ rose from the dead the third day! He has sworn to the naked fact, and then falls into a discourse, which shows conclusively, that he does not believe himself."

Now, sir, permit me to say, that had you ever struck on the most obvious sense of the Apostle in the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, you would have blushed to make the assertions you here offer to the public. You only expose yourself—not the Apostle Paul. This may not, however, disturb your self complacency.

To approach the passage in question as a rational inquirer would approach any investigation of the words of an ancient or even a contemporaneous writer, let us ask, *What is the design of the Apostle in this passage?* Is it to prove that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, or to disprove the Sadducean hypothesis, or the impossibility of the resurrection of the dead? If to prove the former, the Apostle is in your hands—if the latter, you are in his.

I trust you will excuse me for not making an effort to convince you that the design of any discourse is the sovereign key of interpre-

tation to ascertain the exact meaning of the words employed by the writer or speaker.

The pertinency and conclusiveness of every argument depends entirely on the applicability of it to the proposition in reference to which it is advanced. He who would prove the rebuilding of the temple destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar by the arguments which sustain the fact that Cyrus issued a proclamation that it should be rebuilt, argues illogically. He that would cite the proclamation of Cyrus in proof of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, argues as illogically as he that attempts to prove the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, because Titus commanded a Roman army. In the science of geometry he that would prove that the angles at the base of an isoceles triangle are equal to each other, because the three angles of any triangle are equal to two right angles, argues not more inconclusively than he who would prove the late Revolution in France by the Revolution of '89. He that quotes an argument advanced to prove one proposition, and condemns it because it will not prove another proposition, not before the mind of the reasoner, acts as illogically as he that would prove a mathematical theorem by human testimony. This is your error in the passage before us. Paul reasons with some persons in Corinth, who, while they questioned not the literal resurrection of Jesus, doubted or denied the literal resurrection of the dead saints. Had he written or spoken to those who doubted or denied the resurrection of Jesus, his arguments would have been of a different character. Incidentally, indeed, the resurrection of Jesus Christ is proved very conclusively, though without having that object at all in view. Permit me, then, to place before you this argument in its true light. Some of the disciples in Corinth having questioned the resurrection of the dead, Paul reasons with them thus:

'Brethren, I will remind you in the first place of the proclamation I made to you when I first appeared in Corinth. I affirmed that Jesus died for our sins, was buried, and rose again according to the sacred records of the Jews. I assured you that he was seen of Peter, then of the Twelve; after that he was seen of more than five hundred brethren at one time, a majority of whom are living; again he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles; and last of all he was seen by me also, though born too late to have been a witness during the forty days. Whether, then, I or the other Apostles proclaim, so we all proclaimed, and so you all believed. The evidence to you was irresistible. You believed that he died for our sins and rose again the third day. Now upon your own convictions and assured belief of the resurrection of Jesus, let me address you. If it be proclaimed by you as well as by us, that Jesus rose from the dead, how can some among you say that there is no resurrection! For do you not see that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then, contrary to your own faith, Christ has not been raised? And to reduce your denial to a still greater absurdity upon your own principles, our proclamation, though sustained before your eyes by the demonstrations of the Spirit and the power of God, is false; and your faith in Christ's resurrection

is also false. And we, on your hypothesis, must be false witnesses concerning God while he aided us by these demonstrations, in affirming that he raised up Christ, whom he did not raise, if, indeed, the dead rise not: for the resurrection of Jesus and of the dead are so connected that the one implies the other. His resurrection was for them, and is, as the first fruits, an earnest of the harvest.

'Moreover, reflect in how many other contradictions your denial of the resurrection of the dead, while you admit that of Jesus, involves you: for if Christ be not raised, your sins are not pardoned, and all who have been put to death for asserting their faith in his resurrection have perished for ever. They lost the present life for him; and, if the dead rise not, they have lost the future; or, in fact, there is no future life if Jesus be not risen.'

This is the part of the argument against which you object, as if Paul were begging the question, and putting the resurrection of Christ and of the dead "upon the same footing" in point of fact, or hypothesis. It is, indeed, as I have hinted, a conclusive proof of the fact of Christ's resurrection, not because Paul is attempting to prove it, but because he argues with those who, while they denied or doubted the general resurrection, could not, dare not question the fact of the Lord's resurrection. If the fact of Christ's resurrection could have been denied, would not the Sadducean opposition to the general resurrection have easily cut the sinews of the Apostle's argument by questioning that fact. This would have very much aided their cause; but judge how strong must have been the faith of the Corinthians, and how impregnable the evidence of Christ's resurrection, when, with all the eagerness of the opposition to lessen the weight of Paul's authority, and to impugn the general resurrection, no one dared to suggest even a doubt on the subject of the resurrection of the Messiah.

But, as was affirmed, Paul's argument is not to prove that Jesus rose the third day, but to prove that the resurrection of the dead saints is possible and certain, contrary to the Sadducean hypothesis. He, therefore, proceeds to demonstrate, on their own principles, the possibility of it. He affirms it to be reasonable, that, as by a man death came into the world; so by a man the resurrection of the dead should also come: and as by Adam all have died, so by the second Adam all should be made alive. And reasoning from analogy, he shows there is nothing in the vegetable, animal, or mineral kingdoms opposed to the idea, but much in corroboration of it. He shows, moreover, that such was the certainty of mind of the original witnesses, that they jeopardized every thing, life itself, in attesting this truth; and, as all their contemporaries must admit, if in this life only they had all their hopes, they were of all men the most miserable.

I shall now leave it to your candor, if aught remains, to say whether you have not totally misconceived the Apostle's reasoning in this section, and attributed to him an error in reasoning which was wholly your own.

You will, perhaps, yet see that all your reasonings and your alleged contradictions and weaknesses, as you call them, in the original wit-

nesses, are of a character similar to those I have now noticed. In the mean time permit me to ask you, What is there in the hope of immortality so repugnant to your happiness as to cause you to contemn and oppose it? What promised bliss have you in the idea of annihilation or in a material absorption into the elements around you? Have all your longings for immortality died within you? Is there no evergreen in all your landscape—no Eden in your Universe—no tree of life in any Paradise for you? Have you so unmanned yourself as to wish for nothing—as to desire nothing but the crucifixion of the hopes of Christians? Have you found a safer guide than Jesus—brighter luminaries than the Apostles—a more rational hope than the Christian? Or have you every thing to fear, and nothing to hope, from the pretensions of the Saviour and Judge of Men? It is the most mournful spectacle which this debased world has to present to a rational and benevolent mind—an old man tottering before his fall, bereft of every hope beyond the grave, fighting against him who alone can save him from irremediable ruin, and defying Omnipotence to arms—putting forth his last efforts to rob others of their trust in God; and wishing not only himself, but all whom he can influence, to be accursed from Christ! Might I entreat you to retrace your steps, to examine the causes which have led you to this dread alternative, and to ponder well the foundation of your reasonings against the last best hope of dying man! With all benevolence,

EDITOR.

THE TIMES—*No. II.*

UNDER this head may be expected our summaries of the incidents in the history of this reformation. We are so much in arrears, and have such a magazine of incidents, signs, and omens, that we know not where or how to commence. During my late tour of *one hundred days*, I read but little of the sayings and doings of our opponents. I saw and heard, and thought and spoke, without reading or writing much except what the public have seen, and may see in the next number of this work. But we have accumulated much information on things as they are, of use to the cause which we plead; and this, as far as it may be necessary, shall be forthcoming in due time and place.

We have travelled for information, as well as to aid the disciples and to disseminate the principles of reformation. Never was there more need for travelling in quest of information than at present—not for information upon principles, but for correct information on men and measures. If there be any one religious vice more characteristic of this age than another, it is the propensity for *religious lying*. Sorry am I to put it on record, but such is the fact; and the Searcher of all hearts knows that we do not intentionally exaggerate when we say, from the premises before us, that lying, detraction, and slander are *the principal weapons* relied on by a large proportion of the leading opponents of reform. I could not believe, upon any ordinary testimony, that

the Cretan leprosy had spread so far upon the ecclesiastic body politic of our opponents, as my own seeing and hearing, for the last three months, have convinced me. I have become so incredulous in the religious periodicals of the day, in all matters of fact reported, that, on reading any article, I must first know who has written it, before I can assent to, or dissent from, the statements made. No paper has ever been perused by me, political or religious, which is more incredible than "*the Baptist Chronicle & Literary Register*," of Georgetown, Kentucky. It stands first upon my list of incredibles. Others may be as fallacious and as mendacious as it is, but I have not proved them so, having not been through their vicinities and informed myself of the facts, as I have in reference to the Chronicle. Impossible it may be, in publishing the news of the day, to publish nothing but fact, even when an editor is most squeamishly cautious; but there is the originating of falsehoods and the retailing of them, and there are the first, second, and third hand retailers. All that could be expected from a man of truth is, that if he unwittingly publish a falsehood, he would, upon conviction, correct it. And here let me request all our friends and correspondents who may communicate any facts for public inspection, to be scrupulously cautious from what source they have received them, and to hazard nothing upon mere rumor. The misrepresentations of any person's sentiments is a species of lying and slander, which, though not so gross as the originating of falsehoods, is, nevertheless, when intentionally done, as injurious and as criminal. Paul was slanderously reported to have practised, and to have ordered others to practise, evil that good might come. This was as condemnable as the most flagrant violation of the ninth commandment. Of this we have most grievously to complain, in innumerable instances, in the present day.

But next to defamation stands proscription as the order of the day. This matter of proscription has been carried farther by the Baptists than by any other sect in christendom, the Roman Catholics in Spain only excepted. Of this we shall furnish the proof in detail.

I must now formally recant an opinion which I have published somewhere in the *Christian Baptist*. I recollect once, at least, to have published it as my opinion that the Baptist system and spirit were so mild and conciliatory that no person imbued by that spirit could persecute and proscribe. But, alas! they have gone farther in this wayward course than any Protestant sect in this country since the American Revolution. The events of the last year are replete with proofs of this assertion; and if I cannot sustain it by public documents, I will recant it.

But, our opponents being judges, there is no need of reformation. They are not in Babylon. The Baptist society, especially the Regular Baptists, are just up to the standard of ancient and primitive christianity. Their monthly meetings to do business and to hear a sermon, are just the pattern laid down in the New Testament! Their textuary sermonizers are the successors of the Apostles; and when holy hands are laid upon them, they have an official power and holiness,

from which all the laity are excluded. They have the power to consecrate bread, wine, and water, and to intercede as priests for the people. All this and much more than I have yet told, constitute in their views the perfection of the christian institution; hence it is profane to call upon them to reform, or to insinuate that they are yet in the mists of the Great City.

The proscriptions of the advocates for a Baptist priesthood with letters patent to preach and administer ordinances in Kentucky during the last year, have contributed much to the progress of reformation. I say the advocates for a Baptist priesthood, with letters patent to preach, make sermons, and administer ordinances; for this is, in plain English, the merits of their plea, divested of the mantle called *orthodoxy*, by which they influence the laity to aid them. This has made itself so obvious that the most short-sighted can detect it. They do not frankly say, 'Brethren, the cause is ours. We want to continue in Peter's chair, to preach to you, to administer ordinances to you, and to have the care of your souls that you may take care of our bodies. You cannot understand the book, but we can explain it. You dare not approach the Lord's table, but we have an official holiness and power derived from the Apostles by regular Presbyterian ordination. You cannot immerse any believer, however sincere his faith, or ardent his desire to put on Christ; but we have the divine authority so to do.'

This is the real cause, in most instances, why the Baptist clergy raise such a hue and cry against innovation and heresy. As one said before he fled from Kentucky to Missouri last Summer, "The Baptists were not too liberal before, and if Campbellism prevails there will be no place for us in these parts;" so others think it is better to check its ravages in time before the kingdom be lost. But this argument will not do to rouse the laity: they must be aroused by the charge of "dangerous, soul-destroying, and damnable heresy." Hence the bulls of last year, the decrees of councils, and the articles of heresy ascribed to us. But I am much mistaken if these decrees and anathemas react not upon the heads who invented them and defeat not the cause of the priesthood which they are in fact intended to sustain.

While it is the duty, the privilege, and the honor of the brotherhood in Christ to contribute liberally to the necessities of those whom they send to labor in the word and teaching, they cannot, from the New Testament, think, that, *in their church capacity*, they are to wait for a creature called *a preacher*, "to break the bread of life for them," in the cant phrase of Presbyterianism. They cannot think that they must have official heads and hands to administer ordinances, or to make it lawful for them to meet to worship God, and to rejoice in commemorating the loving kindness of the Saviour. To raise up a priesthood of this sort theological schools and colleges are necessary; but to pull down such a system is the prayer and the effort of the Editor, as he shall answer for it to the Judge of All in the last day.

EDITOR.

THE TIMES—*No. III.*

THE SEMPLE AND BROADDUS DECREES.

AMONG the opponents of the reform for which we plead, we are sorry to rank the reputed authors of the following decrees. They are both persons for whom we cherished, and still cherish, great regard. They are the most honorable men in the opposition; and although they had not courage to come out sooner, I did not doubt, from their mincing, but that they would come out, or do themselves an honor which few men at their time of life have ever done. That honor I feared they could not do themselves. It is, however, a wise provision in the kingdom of him whom all ranks of men conspired to put down, that humility must precede honor. He that humbleth himself shall be exalted. The Lord giveth grace to the humble. Humiliating it is for old men, and especially for old preachers, to unteach themselves. To unlearn what we have learned, how hard! But harder still to unteach what we have taught!

I do not impute to them a dishonorable thought, much less a dishonorable act in this matter; yet I feel myself justified in speaking as above. They may not be conscious of the obstacles in the way of their conviction. And how can I suppose them? My answer is, Read Robert B. Semple's last letter to me, and judge whether he does not hold and inculcate opinions which he holds from prejudice, and neither from reason nor revelation. When the attachment to any conclusion is stronger than the premises or the evidences which sustain it, then I am warranted in calling it a prejudice, rather than a sound persuasion. I am liable to be accused of arrogance in pronouncing such an opinion; but my plea is, that a person ought not to presume to teach any thing which he is ashamed to say he understands. He that would presume to teach English grammar, and yet falter in saying that such is, or is not, the correct application of a rule in syntax, merits not the confidence nor the support of the people. And surely he who understands the science of grammar knows what is, or is not, in composition accordant to the first law of syntax. And shall he be called immodest or arrogant in asserting that, according to that principal in syntax, a certain expression is, or is not, in accordance therewith? But the fashion of this age requires that no person should profess to understand the christian religion. It is presumed and taught to be an unintelligible thing; and the more modest a person is in making no pretensions, and the more forward to say that he does not understand it, the greater his reputation for sanctity, and the higher his standing among the metaphysically regenerate.

My good friends, *Semple* and *Broaddus*, wedded as they have been, and still are, to Fullerism, have shown as much moderation and complaisance as could have been expected from any gentlemen imbued with that spirit. And it is to the spirit of the system I attribute their over-acting the part which their zeal for old opinions has prompted. Believing them to be sincere and honest in their convictions, I will approach their DECREES with all moderation and candor when I

shall have given a reason why I have denominated the decrees as above.

Robert B. Semple, as I am informed, (and if I am not correctly informed, I will, on conviction, give publicity to it,) took the first step in this matter. He read the following resolution to his church in order to get up the conference of eight churches, which passed the decrees:—"Whereas it has been *named to this church* that certain persons have been baptized within the bounds of this church, *contrary to our usual regulations;* and being also informed that similar occurrences have taken place in neighboring churches; and apprehensive some unpleasant confusion may rise from it tending to disturb the peace of the churches—*Resolved*, That brethren Josiah Ryland, Hugh Campbell, Robert Courtney, and Temple Walker, be appointed a committee to confer with each other and such committees of other churches as may be necessary, who at some future day may report to this church the result of their conference, and recommend what measures should be taken for the peace and happiness of Zion."

Bishop Semple (for in this he acted *the bishop*) named it to the church, nominated the committee, and thus commenced the crusade. The Bishop did not wait for the conference of his church, but hied away to rouse Andrew Broaddus, appointed the day for the conference, not knowing whether any other church than his and that of Andrew Broaddus would attend. I appeal to Bishop Semple whether this is not a fair history of the origination of this council.

Eight churches, however, attended. Some few of the readers of this paper were appointed; but not one of them, save the priesthood, attended. Not a friend of reform voted in the council. There was no Joseph nor Nicodemus to remonstrate. Here follow the preamble and the decrees, preceded by the minutes of the conference:—

[*From the Religious Herald.*]

CONFERENCE.

On Thursday and Friday, the 30th and 31st December, 1830, a conference was held at Upper King and Queen Meeting-House, composed of a delegation from eight churches belonging to the Dover Association, to take into consideration the state of things produced by the introduction amongst us of the principles and practice known by the name of "Campbellism."

On *Thursday*, at noon, an interesting and instructive discourse was delivered by Elder Robert B. Semple, to a crowded and attentive congregation; after which the Conference was convened. Churches and messengers as follows, viz:—

Bruington—Robert B. Semple, Robert Courtney, Josiah Ryland.
Salem—Andrew Broaddus, Reuben Broaddus.
Upper Essex—Ellis Armstrong, B. H. Munday.
Enon—John Micou.
Mattapony—William Todd, John Pollard.
Axol—John Byrd.
Upper King and Queen—Reuben M. Garnett, George Schools, William Hill.
Piscataway—Philip Montague, George Hill, H. H. Boughan.

Elder *Philip Montague* was chosen Moderator, and Elder *W. Todd*, Clerk.

The object of the meeting being stated, a committee was appointed, consisting of nine members, viz. Andrew Broaddus, Robert B. Semple, Philip Montague, William Todd, John Micou, John Byrd, George Schools, Reuben

Broaddus, and Ellis Armstrong—to sit at night at the house of Col. R. M. Garnett, and form a *Report* to be brought forward and considered to-morrow, and then the Conference adjourned (with prayer) till Friday morning.

Friday.—The Conference met, and after divine worship the Report of the Committee was read by the Chairman, (Elder Andrew Broaddus.) It was then considered article by article, and, with some amendments, was adopted without a dissenting voice.

REPORT.

The association of Christians in visible churches, is designed (among other objects) for the purpose of preserving good order and sound principles. Placing themselves under each other's superintendence, it becomes their duty (for the honor of God's cause and their own peace and happiness) to warn and teach—to exhort, comfort, and build up one another in the faith. By attending to these mutual duties the affairs of each church are preserved in order and decorum. It happens, however, in some instances, that an evil becomes so general, as to affect the peace and well being of a number of churches; and the application of a more general remedy becomes indispensably necessary to restore order and good government, as well as to keep up uniformity and harmony of religious principles. Such seems to be the case in our parts at the present time.

The Baptists, as a religious denomination, (making reasonable allowance for difference of opinion in minor matters,) have professed and practised certain leading principles, which have been characteristic of themselves as a sect, (so called,) or rather as the true scriptural church of Christ. All fellowship among them has been founded on the belief of these principles; of course, any material innovation upon them has uniformly called for church censure, and when the innovation or error has extended over several churches, the remedy has been applied commensurate with the evil. Sometimes these evils have been brought before Associations, and sometimes before Conferences, made up of delegations from the aggrieved churches. This last is the case with the present Conference.

The system of religion known by the name of "Campbellism," has spread of late among our churches to a distressing extent, and seems to call loudly for remedial measures. Accordingly, eight churches, deeply aggrieved by the principles and practices of this new party, have sent their respective delegates to this Conference, to consult, in the fear of God, as to the most proper measures to be adopted in the present state of things.

The errors of this system are various: some of them comparatively unimportant, while others appear to be of the most serious and dangerous tendency. Passing by those of inferior magnitude, we will notice such only as strike at the vitals of godliness, and will endeavor to recommend suitable correctives.

In *principles*, the errors alluded to may be classed under four heads, viz. the denial of the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man—the substitution of reformation for repentance*—the substitution of baptism for conversion, regeneration, or the new birth—and the *Pelagian* doctrine of the sufficiency of man's natural powers to effect his own salvation.†

In *practice*, this party go on to administer baptism in a way radically different from what has been usual among Baptists, and from what we conceive to be the

---

*The Conference were aware that genuine repentance always embraces, or is connected with reformation of conduct; but they were aware also, that reformation (in the popular acceptation of the term) may exist, and sometimes does exist, where there is no evangelical repentance; and that the manner in which it is inculcated by the new party (to the neglect of *penitence*) seems obviously calculated to encourage that sort of reformation merely.

†All persons acquainted with church history will recognize, in this sentiment, one of the distinguishing tenets of *Pelagius* (in the 5th century) and will see it to be an old error recently revived.

New Testament usage—making no inquiry into the experience or the moral standing of the subjects, and going from church to church with, or without, pastors—urging persons to be immersed, and immersing them—in a manner contrary to good order and propriety.

The Conference, therefore, deeply impressed with a sense of the evils herein noticed, and taking into serious consideration the unhappy state of things thence resulting, have come to the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That we consider the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, in the regeneration and salvation of a soul, as a fundamental doctrine of the scriptures, and universally maintained by Baptists (such as we hold in fellowship) in all countries.

2. *Resolved*, That to maintain baptism to be conversion—regeneration—the new birth, and that in baptism sins are *actually* (not figuratively) washed away, is a radical error, founded in popery, and ought not to be countenanced.

3. *Resolved*, That we consider the doctrine of repentance (or penitence for sin) as held among us, and as set forth in the scriptures, to be of vital importance; and that, in its room to substitute *reformation* (as is generally understood) tends to subvert one of the main pillars of the christian religion.

4. *Resolved*, That to maintain the sufficiency of human nature to the purposes of salvation, with the mere written word, and without the gracious influence and aid of *the* Holy Spirit, is, in our view, a plain contradiction of the word of God, a denial of a fundamental doctrine held among Baptists—and a vain attempt to introduce the Pelagian scheme, long since exploded.

5. *Resolved therefore*, That we recommend to our churches, that when any of their members shall maintain all or any of these radical errors, that, in love and tenderness, they endeavor to convince them of their errors; but in the event of failing in the object, that in the fear of God and in the spirit of faithfulness, and after reasonable forbearance, they declare non-fellowship with such, and separate them from their communion as offenders against God and truth.

6. *Resolved*, That in regard to *practice*, we advise that our churches take a decided stand against the disorderly and disorganizing measures pursued by some of the preachers of this party, in going among the churches and administering baptism upon their new plan—flying in the face of all church order, trampling down all former usage among Baptist churches, and disregarding the peace of the churches, and especially of the pastors. Such a course being subversive of all order and regular church government, ought to receive the most prompt and decided reprehension from the churches.

7. *Resolved*, That persons thus baptized ought not to be received into any Baptist church of regular standing, but upon strict examination as to experience, moral standing, and the motives which induced them to such a step. Conscious, however, that many pious and well meaning persons may be misled by these preachers, we would advise that every degree of gentleness and affection be exercised towards them. Finally, brethren, we are well aware, that in all such cases there will arise many difficulties. We would, therefore, recommend the exercise of much prudence and all reasonable forbearance, in any step that may be taken; and especially that you keep a steady eye on the Great Head of the Church, who has promised his effectual aid in every season of need. And with this view,

Resolved, That this Conference recommend to the churches the observance of a day of solemn humiliation, with fasting and prayer, with reference to the state of religion and the distress which has given rise to this meeting. Accordingly, Tuesday, the 8th day of March was appointed for that purpose.

Ordered, That a copy of these proceedings be sent to the "Religious Herald" for publication:

And then, after an affectionate and impressive exhortation from Elder Semple, the Conference was closed with prayer.

Signed in behalf of the Conference,

P. MONTAGUE, *Moderator.*

WM. TODD, *Clerk.*

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT.

This council of *nine* sat at night. How remarkable it is that these councils love darkness rather than the light. It appears that the first council against the author of our religion sat all night; and this last council of which we have heard, sat, if not all night, *at* night; and had their Report in readiness the next morning.

This council have reported that the Baptist sect "IS THE TRUE SCRIPTURAL CHURCH OF CHRIST." When did the true scriptural church of Christ meet in a council at night to proscribe those from the church of Christ who take the whole New Testament for the only guide and arbiter of their faith and manners? When did *the true scriptural church of Christ* meet by proxy, two delegates for each church, to decide upon what course the whole church ought to pursue? The *whole church*, in New Testament times, were wont to assemble on all important occasions. Councils of *nine*, or of *seventy-nine*, can be traced to "*the Man of Sin;*" but we defy christendom to show that ever *the true scriptural church of Christ* once met in a council by day or by night by proxies, delegates, or representatives! "The Catholic Apostolic Church," as she has resolved to call herself, often meets, and has often met in this style, both by day and night; *but the Saviour's church never once!*

Four of the Resolutions touch the *principles*, as they call them; and what are the *four principles?* "The denial of the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man;" "the substitution of reformation for repentance;" "the substitution of baptism for conversion, regeneration, or the new birth;" "and the Pelagian doctrine of the sufficiency of man's natural powers to effect his own salvation." This is the *bill of indictment.* To every item of which we plead *not guilty.* How comes it to pass that councils must, by some fatal necessity, always act perversely? No matter how good the men, when they form such a confederacy, such an unrighteous coalition, it seems they must go wrong. There appears to be infected places in morals, as well as in physics. There is unholy, as well as holy ground. And if men ought to stand barefoot on holy ground, they ought to wear double sandals when they put themselves on Satan's premises. Methinks I would feel such a horror upon me if I assumed to act by proxy for "the true scriptural church of Christ," in any council, that my reason would forsake me. I would hear nothing else but Annas, and Caiphas, and John, and the *high priest's kindred* echoing in every corner of the room. May the good Lord, who cast an eye of pity upon Peter, look these mistaken men into tears of contrition! I wish them that evangelical repentance which needs never to be regretted. I hope they may feel that repentance unto reformation which they affect to think that we renounce.

Sorry I am that they have forbid me to call them brethren; else I would have besought them, if there be any bowels of mercies in their system, to repent of this their unrighteous course, and to bring forth fruits worthy of reformation.

But they have passed the Rubicon, and have declared war against reformation. And in doing this, they have, to justify themselves, given a false representation of the views which we have laid before the public. They have manufactured for us certain principles which they know are obnoxious, and from this time forth we are to be nicknamed *Pelagians*.

If I did not know that the influence of these men had been for some years on the wane, I should have had more reason to lament for the times—to take up my parable, and to say with Jeremiah, "O, daughter of Jerusalem, what shall I equal to thee, that I may comfort thee! O, virgin daughter of Zion! for thy breaches are great like the sea; who can heal thee! Thy Prophets have seen vain and foolish things for thee, and they have not discovered their iniquity to turn away thy captivity; but have seen for thee false burdens and causes of banishment!"

But there is a redeeming spirit in the people; and great names and venerable traditions cannot long fetter their reason nor embargo their thoughts. But our persecutors are conscientious men. Grant it; therefore I hope they may obtain pardon. Paul said, "I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." He lived in all good conscience until the day he obtained mercy.

How uncharitable the spirit of Calvinism! Although these men have spoken and written in commendation of our defences of the Christian religion, of the distinguishing institutions of that religion, of many of our essays upon the capital items of the Christian Scriptures; yet, because they took it into their heads that we were willing to cast overboard the philosophy of Andrew Fuller, and to give to immersion a place next to faith in the Christian economy, they have decreed to deal to us the portion of infidels and the profane.

The "*principles*," as they call them, which they misrepresent, are these:—We have opposed the whole mystic system of interpreting the book, and the idea that God has given us an unintelligible and incredible testimony. We have taught that our power to believe is not in ourselves, but in the testimony, or in him who gives testimony. That God has rendered the testimony credible, or has made us able to believe it, because confirmed by signs, by miracles, by all the gifts of the Holy Spirit. We contend that as the testimony is confirmed, there is no promise in the book, as there is no need of, supernatural and physical aid to help men to believe. That so soon as men believe sincerely, or in the heart, that Jesus is the Son of God, and the only way and name given to men by which they can be saved, and are immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they are pardoned, regenerated, saved, adopted, reconciled to God, and receive the Holy Spirit. This is the head and front of our offending. We neither make faith by itself, nor water by itself, nor the name of the Lord by itself, nor the blood of Christ by itself, nor grace by itself, *regeneration*, *conversion*, or *salvation*. We never separate repentance and reformation. We cannot conceive of a reformation unto life without a change of mind and sorrow for the past. But we

choose to use Bible terms in preference to the scholastic. Without a pure heart and a holy life, we teach that no man can enter into the everlasting kingdom.

Baptism, without faith in the blood of Jesus, we contend avails nothing. But that to him that believes and is immersed, we assert that Jesus promised salvation. That immersion to a believer is the sign and medium of remission of sins, we must teach; or, in the words of the book, we must proclaim immersion for the remission of sins to every one that believes God's testimony. But, candid reader, compare this with the caricature given by *the Council of Nine*, and confirmed by the conference of six more proxies.

But I ought to thank this Council for their moderation, and Mr. *Keeling* of Richmond, who has yoked his fortunes to the car of this good Council, for his comment on their proceedings; for, indeed, the text needed both his comment and his apology: I say, I must thank them for reducing my capital errors to *four* principles, and yet these four are reducible to *two*. The whole matter, in brief, is the denial of their mystic influences of the Holy Spirit, and immersion for the remission of sins.

Now I ask my friends, Semple and Broaddus, touching this their divine operation, what avails their opinion about it; for, themselves being judges, the holding such an opinion does not secure to any human being this their divine operation? A preacher's believing it, will not secure it to his flock; else Mr. Semple's congregation would long since have felt it: nor does the concurrence of any congregation with him in this opinion, secure it to them. It is just like an opinion about the inhabitants of the Moon: it neither adds one to the number nor subtracts one from it: it alters not the color of the hair or eyes of one of them It is an opinion which may do harm, but can do no good. It may do much harm by causing many to neglect the testimony of God, and to put off obedience till, what *they* choose to call, "God's own time."

That God has "*his own time*" for converting every person, is a favorite point with many. This "his own time" has caused many to neglect the "*now*" and the "*to-day*" arguments of the Holy Spirit; for if I must wait God's time, it is my duty not to obey till God's time. I argue not this question in this place. I only hint that the opinion can do no good, and may do much harm. And, because we differ from them in this *one opinion*, they have, if we do not repent of it, assigned us our portion with infidels and hypocrites: I say, "*one opinion*?" for none of the other charges will at all, in any conceivable latitude of interpretation, apply to us. We do not substitute reformation for repentance, except they mean *the term*, and not *the thing*. But we prefer the term "reformation" to their distinction "between legal and evangelical repentance." Neither do we substitute baptism for conversion. And as for the Pelagian notion of "man's natural powers to effect his own salvation," it is a chimera of their own heads. We never said nor thought such a thing!

But they have passed a string of resolutions longer that "the Apos-

tle's Creed" and the "Ten Commandments;" and one of them has the iron bedstead fixed at bare *five feet*. A *spiritual court* for examining experiences is also established: so that if a person should confess the Lord Jesus and be immersed for the remission of his sins, before he can be permitted to sit down at the same religious table with my good friends Robert B. Semple and Andrew Broaddus, he must appear before said court having spiritual jurisdiction over motives and cases of conscience; and he must then, and there, relate his unbelieving experience, or his unchristian experience: for no man can begin to have christian experience until he feels himself under the government of Jesus Christ.

The following resolution is exactly in accordance with No. 7:—

'Whereas many persons in this county of King and Queen, have recently entered into the holy bands of matrimony; and whereas many females, without consulting us, the heads of families, of much experience in this said county, have been married upon the mere profession of confidence and affection, and a vow of fidelity to their respective bridegrooms—*Resolved*, That before any such brides shall be received into the company and fellowship of married ladies, they shall have to give an account of their experience of the married state previous to their making the marriage vow; and for this purpose a quorum of all the married ladies in the county shall meet annually in said county for hearing conjugal experiences.'

These well-meaning and benevolent old disciples cannot now learn that christian experience must always begin *after*, and not *before*, a person's putting on Christ. If I were to attempt to convince them that a person must first be in any state before he can experience that state, I should again, perhaps, be published to the Old Virginians, as denying christian experience. I shall therefore desist, believing it to be not in my power to persuade Messrs. Semple and Broaddus, that, before a man can have the experience of a father, a master, a husband, or brother, he must stand in these relations—and, consequently, before a man can have christian experience, he must be a christian.

We have no "*Star Chamber Court*" in Virginia; but this new court now instituted by Messrs. *Semple* and *Broaddus*, approaches it as nearly as the climate of Virginia and the year 1831 will permit. I cannot but say that this caucus and these resolutions transcend any thing I expected from that quarter: and hence I venture to predict that the reformation in Virginia is now about to march with greater velocity.

No two men have done more to accelerate its progress than my good friends Messrs. *Semple* and *Broaddus*; first, by commending it; in the second place, by writing against it; and when argument failed, in the last place, by taking hold of the strong arm with which all the antichristian sects have opposed reformation. I need not say that I mean councils, resolutions, and excommunications.

Before concluding this already protracted article, I hope I may be permitted to say a word to my friends *Semple* and *Broaddus*:—You, kind sirs, have had an immense influence once, and still have much

influence over the minds of the Baptists in your section of Virginia. This gives to your decrees a power which no logic, demonstration, nor argument of mine could command. You are conscious of this I doubt not; else you would not have substituted decrees for arguments. But why is it that in your own churches and in your own neighborhoods, where your talents and virtues are best known and much appreciated, you were obliged to make a shield of your popularity and of the prejudices of the people to protect you against the progress of light and the spirit of inquiry. To the thinking part of this community your last act has given a more convincing testimony of the irresistible progress and power of the ancient gospel than any act of your lives. Your having written a volume in favor of it, would not have spoken so much in its praise. Those who know your age in the ministry, your long labors, your great talents, and many virtues, will now be apt to wonder and say, 'Is it possible that brethren *Semple* and *Broaddus* had to sustain themselves and their cause among their own converts by decrees and anathemas so stern and decisive? Is it possible that a day of humiliation and prayer had to be appointed to deprecate the distress coming upon these good brethren, because their own congregations have presumed not to call them Father and Master?'

If, however, in an evil hour the enemy has obtained an advantage over you, and you are still disposed to *reason*, rather than *decree*—to *discuss*, rather than to *anathematize*—I will once more invite you to these pages. I will, with all pleasure, give you page for page with me. And if you will agree, either of you, or both, to discuss these articles of difference, one by one, inform me of it, and you will have every facility which I possess to give publicity to your views.

I sympathize with you, believing you to be the most honorable of my opponents and to be conscientious as far as any men can be, who appeal to proscriptive decrees. I know you appear to fear that vital religion is endangered by our representations of the ancient gospel. We know that the reverse is the fact. Our greatest objection to your philosophy is, that it substitutes an imaginary work of grace upon the heart, for that love, and peace, and joy, and purity which a clear perception of, and an unfeigned submission to, the ancient gospel, can alone produce and maintain.

We plead for faith, repentance, reformation, a new heart, and universal obedience—and ascribe to grace, and the blood of Jesus, to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, every thing which the Scriptures teach, in their own words and sentences, to the fullest import and meaning of them; but each in its proper place.

Please accept my thanks that you did not adopt Dr. Noel's *Thirty-Nine Articles;* that you did not accuse us of Arianism, Sabellianism, Universalism, or Deism; and that you did not forbid the reading of our writings in private families. For these *favors* you are entitled to our thanks; and I can sincerely pray that you may repent and preach the old faith which you are now laboring, in part, to destroy.

EDITOR.

DELUSIONS.

EVERY age of the world has produced impostors and delusions. Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, and were followed by Pharaoh, his court, and clergy. They for some time supported their pretensions, much to the annoyance of the cause of the Israelites and their leader Moses.

To say nothing of the false prophets of the Jewish age, the diviners, soothsayers, magicians, and all the ministry of idols among the Gentiles, by which the nations were so often deceived, the impostors which have appeared since the Christian era would fill volumes of the most lamentable details ever read. The false Messiahs which have afflicted the Jews since the rejection of Jesus of Nazareth, have more than verified all the predictions of the Faithful and True Witness. No less than *twenty-four* distinguished false Messiahs have disturbed the Jews. Many were deceived, and myriads lost their lives through their impostures. Some peculiar epochs were distinguished for the number and impudence of these impostors. If the people had fixed upon any year as likely to terminate their dispersions, and as the period of their return, that year rarely failed to produce a Messiah. Hence, in the twelfth century no less than *ten* false Messiahs appeared.

The year 1666 was a year of great expectation, and gave birth to the appearance of one of the most remarkable of the false Christs. "Great multitudes marched from unknown parts to the remote deserts of Arabia, and they were supposed to be the ten tribes of Israel, who had been dispersed for many ages. It was said that a ship was arrived in the north part of Scotland with sails and cordage of silk, that the mariners spoke nothing but Hebrew, and on the sails was this motto: "The Twelve Tribes of Israel." Then it was that Sabati Levi appeared at Smyrna and professed to be the Messiah." The Jews gave up their business and attended to him. He obtained one Nathan in Jerusalem to pass for his Elias or forerunner. Nathan prophesied for him, and the Jews became very penitent, and reformed under the expectation that the Messiah would appear in two years. "Some fasted so long that they died—some endured melting wax to be dropped on their flesh—some rolled in snow—many whipped themselves. Superfluities in dress and household furniture were dispensed with; property was sold to large amounts, and immense contributions were made to the poor. Though he met with much opposition, his followers increased, and began in large numbers to prophesy and fall into ecstacies. Four hundred men and women prophesied of his growing kingdom, and young infants who could hardly speak would plainly pronounce "*Sabatai, Messiah* and Son of God." The people were for a time possessed, and voices were heard from their bowels. Some fell into trances, foamed at the mouth, recounted their future prosperity, their visions of the Lion of Judah, and the triumphs of Sabatai."

"When he was brought before the Magistrates, someaffirmed they saw a pillar of fire between him and the Cadi or Magistrates, and others actually swore that they saw it. This the credulous Jews believed.—Those who would not believe in him were shunned as excommunicated persons, and all intercourse with them prohibited.

"The Grand Seignor determined to try his faith by stripping him naked and setting him a mark for his archers; but rather than subject himself to this test, he turned Mahometan, to the great confusion of the Jews."

We have been thus particular in giving a few of the incidents of the life of this impostor, as a specimen of the others; and because of some remarkable analogies between him and the present New York impostor.

Numerous have been the impostors among christians since the great apostacy began; especially since, and at the time of the Reformation. Munzer, Stubner, and Stork, were conspicuous in the beginning of the 16th century. "These men taught that among christians who had the precepts of the Gospel to guide them, and the Spirit of God to direct them, the office of magistracy was not only unnecessary, but an unlawful encroachment on their spiritual liberty; that

the distinctions occasioned by birth, rank, or wealth, should be abolished; that all christians should put their possessions into one common stock, and live together in that state of equality which becomes members of the same family; and that polygamy was not incompatible with either the Old or New Testament. They related many visions and revelations which they had from above; but failing to propagate their views by these means, they attempted to propagate them by arms. Many Catholics joined them, and in the various insurrections which they effected, 100,000 souls are said to have been sacrificed."

Since the Millennium and the evils of sectarianism have been the subjects of much speaking and writing, impostures have been numerous. In the memory of the present generation, many delusions have been propagated and received. The Shakers, a sect instituted by Anna Lesse, in 1774, have not yet quite dwindled away. This Elect Lady, as they style her, was the head of this party, and gave them a new Bible. "They assert that she spoke seventy-two languages, and conversed with the dead. Through her all blessings flow to her followers—She appointed the sarced dance and the fantastic song, and consecrated shivering, swooning, and falling down, acts of acceptable devotion. They are for a common stock, and rank marriage among the works of the flesh—They are plain in their apparel, and assume the aspect of the friars and nuns of Catholic superstition."

The Barkers, Jumpers, and Mutterers of the present age, need not be mentioned here. Nor need we detail the history of a Miss Campbell, who, in good old Scotland a year or two since, came back from the dead and had the gift of tongues; who was believed in by several ministers of the Church of Scotland, and some distinguished members of the Scotch Bar. But we shall proceed to notice the most recent and the most impudent delusion which has appeared in our time. The people that have received this imposture are called

THE MORMONITES.

I have just examined their Bible, and will first notice its contents It is called "The Book of Mormon, an account written by the hand of Mormon, upon plates taken from the plates of Nephi; wherefore it is an abridgement of the Record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites, written to the Lamanites, which are a remnant of the House of Israel, and also to Jew and Gentile: written by way of Commandment, and also by the Spirit of Prophecy and of Revelation."—"*By Joseph Smith, Junior, Author and Proprietor.*"—From plates dug out of the earth in the township of Manchester, Ontario county, New York—Palmyra, printed by E. B. Grandin, for the Author, 1830. It is a collection of Books said to have been written by different persons during the interval of 1020 years.—The 1st and second Books of Nephi occupy 122 pages; the Book of Jacob the brother of Nephi occupies 21; that of Enos 3; that of Jarom 2; that of Omni 4; the Words of Mormon 3; the Book of Mosiah 68; that of Alma 186; that of Helaman 44; that of Nephi the son of Helaman 66; that of Mormon 20; that of Ether 35; and that of Moroni 14 pages; making in all 588 octavo pages.

This romance—but this is for it a name too innocent—begins with the religious adventures of one Lehi, whose wife was Sariah, and their four sons, Laman, Lemuel, Sam, and Nephi. Lehi lived in Jerusalem all his life, up till the 1st year of Zedekiah, King of Judah; and when the prophets appeared foretelling the utter destruction of Jerusalem, Lehi humbled himself, and after various visions and revelations, started with his sons into the wilderness. Lehi, before his departure, forgot to bring with him the records of his family, and that of the Jews; but Nephi, his younger son, with much pious courage, returned, and succeeded in getting upon plates of brass the Records of the Jews from the Creation down to the 1st year of Zedekiah, King of Judah—and also the prophets including many prophecies delivered by Jeremiah.

From the records it appeared that this Lehi was a son of Joseph. He prevailed on one Ishmael and his family to accompany him into the wilderness, whose daughters the sons of Lehi took for wives

Lehi was a greater prophet than any of the Jewish prophets, and uttered all the events of the christian era, and developed the records of Matthew, Luke and John, 600 years before John the Baptist was born.—These pilgrims travelled several days journey in some wilderness, "a South, South-east direction, along the borders of the Red Sea." A ball with pointers on it, inscribed with various intelligence, legible at proper times, was the pillar and index in passing through the wilderness for many, very many days. By their bow and arrow they lived for eight years, travelling an easterly course from Jerusalem, until they came to a great sea. By divine revelation Nephi constructed a ship, and although opposed by his unbelieving brethren, being greatly assisted by the Holy Spirit, he succeeded in launching her safely, and got all his tribe, with all their stock of seeds, animals, and provisions, safely aboard. They had "*a compass*," which none but Nephi knew how to manage; but the Lord had promised them a fine land, and after many perils and trials, and a long passage, they safely arrived at the land of promise. Nephi made brazen plates soon after his arrival in America, for that was the land of promise to them, and on these plates he marked their peregrinations and adventures, and all the prophecies which God gave to him concerning the future destinies of his people, and the human race.

After his father's death, his brethren rebelled against him. They finally separated in the wilderness, and became the heads of different tribes, often in the lapse of generations making incursions upon each other. The Nephites, like their father, for many generations were good christians, believers in the doctrines of the Calvinists and Methodists, and preaching baptism and other christian usages hundreds of years before Jesus Christ was born!

Before Nephi died, which was about 55 years from the flight of Lehi from Jerusalem, he had preached to his people every thing which is now preached in the state of New York, and anointed or ordained his brother Jacob priest over his people, called the Nephites. Jacob brought up his son Enos "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," gave him the plates, and left him successor in office over the people of Nephi. Enos says "there came a voice to me, saying, Enos thy sins are forgiven thee, and thou shalt be blessed. And, I sayeth, Lord how is it done. And he sayeth unto me, Because of thy faith in Christ, whom thou hast not heard nor seen." page 143. Enos died 179 years from the hegira of Lehi; consequently, this happened 431 years before Jesus Christ was born. He was a contemporary with Nehemiah, and may we not say how much wiser and more enlightened were the Nephites in America than the Jews at their return to Jerusalem!!

Enos gave the plates to Jarom, his son. In his time "they kept the law of Moses and the Sabbath day holy to the Lord." During the priesthood and reign of Enos, there were many commotions and wars between his people and the Lamanites. Then the sharp pointed arrow, the quiver, and the dart, were invented. Jarom delivered his plates to his son Omni, and gave up the ghost 238 years from the flight of Lehi. Omni died 276 years from the hegira, and gave the plates to his son Amaron, who, in the year 320, gave them to his brother Chemish; he, to his son Abinadom; he, to his son Amaleki; and he, having no son, gave them to the just and pious King Benjamin.

King Benjamin had three sons, Mosiah, Helorum, and Helaman, whom he educated in all the learning of his fathers. To Mosiah he delivered up the plates of Nephi, the ball which guided them through the wilderness, and the sword of one Laban, of mighty renown. King Benjamin addressed his people from the new temple which they had erected, for they had, even then, built a temple, synagogues, and a tower, in the New World.

King Benjamin assembled the people to sacrifice according to the law around the new temple; and he enjoined upon them, at the same time, the christian institutions, and gave them a patriarchal valedictory. After they had heard him speak, and had offered up their sacrifices, they fell down and prayed in the following words: "O have mercy, and apply the atoning blood

of Christ, that we may receive forgiveness of our sins, and our hearts may be purified; for we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, who created Heaven and Earth and all things, who shall come down among the children of men." Then the Spirit of the Lord fell upon them and they were filled with joy, having received a remission of their sins." p. 162.

King Benjamin ordered his people to take upon them the name of Christ, and in these remarkable words—"There is no other name given whereby salvation cometh; therefore I would that you should take upon you the name of Christ, all you that have entered into the covenant with God that ye should be obedient unto the end of your lives." p. 166. They all took upon them the name of Christ; and he, having ordained them priests and teachers, and appointed his son Mosiah to reign in his stead, gave up the ghost, 476 years after Lehi's escape from Jerusalem, and 124 before Christ was born. Mosiah gave the plates of brass and all "the things which he had kept" to Alma, the son of Alma, who was appointed "chief judge and high priest," the people willing to have no King, and Mosiah died 569 years from the time Lehi left Jerusalem.

In the 14th year of the judges, and 69 years before the birth of Jesus, they sent out missionary priests who preached through all the tribes of the country against all vices; "holding forth the coming of the Son of God, his sufferings, death and resurrection – and that he should appear unto them after his resurrection: and this the people did hear with great joy and gladness." p. 268.

Alma's Book reaches down to the end of the 39th year of the judges. These were wonderful years—many cities were founded, many battles were fought, fortifications reared, letters written, and even in one year a certain Hagoth built an exceeding large ship, and launched it forth into the West Sea. In this embarked many of the Nephites. This same ship builder the next year built other ships – one was lost with all its passengers and crew.—p. 406.

Many prophecies were pronounced: one that in 400 years after the coming of Christ the Nephites would lose their religion. During the time of the judges, many were called christians by name, and "baptism unto repentance" was a common thing. "And it came to pass that they did appoint priests and teachers throughout all the land, over all the churches." p. 349. "And those who did belong to the church were faithful; yea, all those who were true believers in Christ took upon them gladly the name of Christ, or christians, as they were called, because of their belief in Christ." p. 301. "And it came to pass that there were many who died, firmly believing that their souls were redeemed by the Lord Jesus Christ: thus they went out of the world rejoicing." p. 353. "The word was preached by Helaman, Shiblon, Corianton, Amnon, and his brethren, &c yea, and all those who had been ordained by the holy order of God, being baptized unto repentance, and sent forth to preach unto the people." p. 362. This happened in the 19th year of the judges, 72 years before the birth of Jesus. Before this time synagogues with pulpits were built, "for the Zoramites," a sort of Episcopalians, "gathered themselves together on one day of the week, which day they called the day of the Lord"—"and they had a place which was high and lifted up, which held but one man, who read prayers, the same prayers every week; and this high place was called Rameumptom, which being interpreted is the *Holy Stand*." p. 311.

The Book of Helaman reacheth down to the 90th year of the judges, and to the year preceding that in which the Messiah was born. During the period embraced in Helaman's narrative, many ten thousands were baptized. "And behold the Holy Spirit of God did come down from heaven, and did enter into their hearts, and they were filled as with fire, and they could speak forth marvellous words." p. 421. Masonry was invented about this time; for men began to bind themselves in secret oaths to aid one another in all things,

good and evil. p. 424. Powers of loosing and binding in heaven were conferred upon Nephi, the son of Helaman, and all miraculous powers, such as the Apostles possessed. One Samuel, also, foretold that the Christ would be born in five years, and that the night before should be as light as day; and that the day of his death should be a day of darkness, like the night." p. 445.

The Book of this Nephi commences with the birth of the Messiah, 600 years from the departure of Lehi from Jerusalem. In the midst of the threats of the infidels to slaughter the faithful, the sun set; but lo! the night was as clear as mid day, and from that period they changed their era, and counted time as we do. A star also appeared, but it is not stated how it could be seen in a night as bright as day—but it was universally seen throughout all the land, to the salvation of the pious from the threats of their enemies.

The terrors of the day of his death are also stated, and in the 34th year from his nativity, after his resurrection, he descended from heaven and visited the people of Nephi. Jesus called upon them to examine his hands and his sides, as he did Thomas, though none of them had expressed a doubt. Two thousand five hundred men, women and children, one by one, examined him, and then worshipped him. He commanded Nephi to baptize, and gave him the words which he was to use, viz: "Having authority given me of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." He commissioned eleven others, who, with Nephi, were his twelve American Apostles, and promised himself to baptize their converts "with fire and with the Holy Spirit."

He delivers them the Sermon upon the Mount, and some other sayings recorded in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. He healed all their diseases, and prayed for their children; but the things spoken were so great and marvellous that they could not be spoken nor written.

He ordained one to administer the supper, who alone had authority to dispense it to the disciples baptized in his name. The only new commandments which were given to the American christians on his occasional visits which were repeated, were—"Pray in your families unto the Father, always in my name, that your wives and your children may be blessed." "Meet often, and forbid no man from coming unto you when you shall meet together." p. 492.

Nephi was chief among the 12 Apostles: he baptized himself, and then baptized the eleven, whose names were Timothy, Jonas, Mathoni and Mathonihah. Kumen, Kumenonhi, Jeremiah, Shimnon, Jonas, Zedekiah, and Isaiah. "They were beptized in fire and the Holy Ghost." Not a new word, however, could be written in addition to those found in the New Testament; for although he spake for several days to these American disciples, none of the new and marvellous sayings could be uttered or written!! He inspected the plates of Nephi, and only found one omission, which was, that he failed to mention the resurrection of many saints in America at the time of the tempest and earthquake. He commanded these Nephites to be called christians.

The Book of Nephi the son of Nephi, gives, in 4 pages, the history of 320 years after Christ. In the 36 h year, all the inhabitants of the land were converted. There was a perfect community, and no disputations in the land for 170 years Three of the American Apostles were never to die, and were seen 400 years after Christ; but what has become of them no one can tell, except Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris, the three witnesses of the truth of the plates of Nephi, be these three immortal men. Towards the close of the history of Nephi or he record of Ammaron, sects and divisions and battles became frequent, and all goodness had almost left the continent in the year 320.

Mormon appears next in the drama, the recording angel of the whole matter, who, by the way, was a mighty general and great christian; he commanded in one engagement 42,000 men against the Lamanites!!! He was no Quaker! This dreadful battle was fought A. D. 330. The Lamanites took

South America for themselves, and gave North America to the Nephites. Mormon was very orthodox, for he preached in these words, A. D. 362:—"*That Jesus was the very Christ, and the very God.*" He must have heard of the Arian controversy by some angel!!

Moroni finishes what Mormon, his father, left undone, and continues the history till A. D. 400. He pleads that no one shall disbelieve his record because of its imperfections!! and declares that none who receive it will condemn it on account of its imperfections, and for not doing so, the same shall know greater things. p. 532. "*He that condemneth it shall be in danger of hell fire.*" He laments the prevalency of free masonry in the times when his Book should be dug up out of the earth, and proves that miracles will never cease; because God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever—consequently, must always create suns, moons, and stars, every day!! He exhorted to take heed that none be baptized without telling their experience, nor partake of *the Sacrament* of Christ unworthily"!! p. 537.

Moroni, in the conclusion of his Book of Mormon, says, if his plates had been larger he would have written in Hebrew; but because of this difficulty, he wrote in the "Reformed Egyptian," being handed down and altered unto us according to our manner of speech." p. 538. "Condemn me not," says he, "because of mine imperfections; neither my father, because of his imperfections; neither them which have written before him; but rather give thanks unto God that he hath made manifest unto you our imperfections, that you may learn to be more wise than we have been." p. 538. A very necessary advice, indeed!!

Moroni writes the Book of Ether, containing an account of the people of Jared, who escaped from the building of the tower of Babel unconfounded in his language. These people of Jared God marched before in a cloud, and directed them through the wilderness, and instructed them to build *barges* to cross seas; and finally they built eight barges, air-tight, and were commanded to make a hole in the top to admit air, and one in the bottom to admit water; and in them were put 16 windows of *molten stone*, which, when touched by the finger of Jesus, became as transparent as any glass, and gave them light under "the mountain waves," and when above the water. He that touched these stones appeared unto the brother of Jared, and said: "Behold I am Jesus Christ. *I am the Father and the Son.*" Two of these stones were sealed up with the plates, and became the spectacles of Joseph Smith, according to a prediction uttered before Abraham was born. It was also foretold in the Book of Ether, written by Moroni, that he that should find the plates should have the privilege of shewing the plates unto those who shall assist to bring forth this work; and unto *three* shall they be shewn by the power of God; wherefore they shall of a surety know that these things are true." p. 548.

And the eight barges, air-tight, made like ducks, after swimming and diying 344 days, arrived on the coasts of the land of promise. The Book of Ether relates the wars and carnage amongst these people. In the lapse of generations they counted two millions of mighty men, besides women and children, slain; and finally, they were all killed but one, and he fell to the earth as if he had no life. So ends the Book of Ether, p. 573.

The book of Moroni details the manner of ordaining priests and teachers, the manner of administering ordinances, and the epistles of Mormon to his son Moroni. Moroni seals up the record A. D. 420, and assures the world that spiritual gifts shall never cease, only through unbelief. And when the plates of Nephi should be dug up out of the earth, he declares that "men should ask God the Eternal Father in the name of Christ: if these things are not true." "If with a sincere heart and real intent, having faith in Christ, such prayers are made, ye shall know the truth of all things," p. 586.

The testimony of Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and Martin Harris, asserting that they saw the plates, is appended. They also testify that they know

that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for his voice had declared it unto them.

Another testimony is appended, signed by four Whitmers, one Hiram Page, and three Smiths, affirming that they saw the plates, handled them, and that Smith has got the plates in his possession.

Such is an analysis of the book of Mormon, the Bible of the Mormonites. For noticing of which I would have asked forgiveness from all my readers, had not several hundred persons of different denominations believed in it. On this account alone has it become necessary to notice it, and for the same reason we must examine its pretensions to divine authority; for it purports to be a revelation from God. And in the first place, we shall examine its internal evidences.

INTERNAL EVIDENCES.

It admits the Old and New Testaments to contain the revelations, institutions, and commandments of God to Patriarchs, Jews, and Gentiles, down to the year 1830—and always, as such, speaks of them and quotes them. This admission at once blasts its pretentions to credibility. For no man with his eyes open can admit both books to have come from God. Admitting the Bible now received to have come from God, it is impossible that the book of Mormon came from the same Author. For the following reasons:—

I. Smith, its real author, as ignorant and as impudent a knave as ever wrote a book, betrays the cloven foot in basing his whole book upon a false fact, or a pretended fact, which makes God a liar. It is this:—With the Jews God made a covenant at Mount Sinai, and instituted a priesthood, and a high priesthood. The priesthood he gave to the tribe of Levi, and the high priesthood to Aaron and his sons for an everlasting priesthood. He separated Levi, and covenanted to give him this office irrevocably while ever the temple stood, or till the Messiah came. "Then, says God, Moses shall appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on their priest's office, and the stranger, (the person of another family,) who cometh nigh, shall be put to death." Numbers iii. 10. "And the priests, the sons of Levi, shall come near; for them the Lord thy God hath chosen to minister unto him, and to bless in the name of the Lord, and by their word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried." Deut. xxi. 5. Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, with 250 men of renown, rebelled against a part of the institution of the priesthood, and the Lord destroyed them in the presence of the whole congregation. This was to be a memorial that no stranger invade any part of the office of the priesthood. Num. xvi. 40. "Fourteen thousand and seven hundred of the people were destroyed by a plague for murmuring against this memorial.

In the 18th chapter of Numbers the Levites are again given to Aaron and his sons, and the priesthood confirmed to them with this threat—"The stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." "Even Jesus, says Paul, were he on earth, could not be a priest; for he was of a tribe concerning which Moses spake nothing of priesthood." Heb. vii. 13. So irrevocable was the grant of the priesthood to Levi, and of the high priesthood to Aaron, that no stranger dare approach the altar of God which Moses established. Hence, Jesus himself was excluded from officiating as priest on earth according to the law.

This Joseph Smith overlooked in his impious fraud, and makes his hero Lehi spring from Joseph. And just as soon as his sons return with the roll of his lineage, ascertaining that he was of the tribe of Joseph, he and his sons acceptably "offer sacrifices and burnt offerings to the Lord," p. 15. Also it is repeated, p. 18—Nephi became chief artificer, ship-builder, and mariner; was scribe, prophet, priest, and king unto his own people, and "consecrated Jacob and Joseph the sons of his father priests to God and teachers—almost 600 years before the fulness of the times of the Jewish economy was completed, p. 72. Nephi represents himself withal "as under the law of Moses," p. 105. They build a *temple* in the new world, and in 55 years after they leave Jerusalem, make a new priesthood which God approbates. A high

priest is also consecrated and yet they are all the while "teaching the law of Moses, and exhorting the people to keep it!!! p. 146, 209. Thus God is represented as instituting, approbating, and blessing a new priesthood from the tribe of Joseph, concerning which Moses gave no commandment concerning priesthood. Although God had promised in the law of Moses that if any man, not of the tribe and family of Levi and Aaron, should approach the office of priest, he would surely die; he is represented by Smith as blessing, approbating, and sustaining another family in this appropriated office. The God of Abraham or Joseph Smith must then be a liar!! And who will hesitate to pronounce him an impostor? This lie runs through his records for the first 600 years of his story.

II. This ignorant and impudent liar, in the next place, makes the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, violate his covenants with Israel and Judah concerning the land of Canaan, by promising a new land to a pious Jew. If a company of reprobate Jews had departed from Jerusalem and the temple in the days of Zedekiah, and founded a new colony, it would not have been so incongruous. But to represent God as inspiring a devout Jew and a prophet, such as Lehi and Nephi are represented by Smith, with a resolution to forsake Jerusalem and God's own house, and to depart from the land which God swore to their fathers so long as they were obedient; and to guide by miracle and bless by prodigies a good man in forsaking God's covenant and worship—is so monstrous an error that language fails to afford a name for it. It is to make God violate his own covenants, and to set at nought his own promises, and to convert his own curses into blessings. Excision from the commonwealth of Israel, and banishment from Jerusalem and the temple, were the greatest curses the law of Moses knew. But Smith makes a good and pious Jew the subject of this curse, and sends him off into the inhospitable wilderness, disinherits him in Canaan, and makes him more happy in forsaking the institutions of Moses, more intelligent in the wilderness, and more prosperous in adversity, than even the Jews in their best days, in the best of lands, and under the best of all governments!!! The impostor was too ignorant of the history of the Jews and the nature of the covenants of promise to have even alluded to them in his book if he had not supposed that he had the plates of Moses in his own keeping as he had his "molton plates" of Nephi. To separate a family from the nation of Israel, was to accumulate all the curses of the law upon that family, Deut. xxix. 21.

III. He has more of the Jews living in the new world than could have been numbered any where else, even in the days of John the Baptist; and has placed them under a new dynasty. The sceptre, with him, has departed from Judah, and a law-giver from among his descendents, hundreds of years before Shiloh came; and King Benjamin is a wiser and more renowned King than King Solomon. He seems to have gone upon an adage which saith:—"the more marvellous the more credible the tale," and the less of fact, and the more of fiction the more intelligible and reasonable the narrative.

IV. He represents the temple worship as continued in his new land of promise contrary to every precept of the Law, and so happy are the people of Nephi as never to shed a tear on account of excision, nor to turn an eye towards Jerusalem or God's temple. The pious Jews in the captivity turned their faces to Jerusalem and the holy place, and remembered God's promises concerning the place where he recorded his name. They hung their harps upon the willow trees, and could not sing the songs of Zion in a foreign land; but the Nephites have not a single wish for Jerusalem, for they can, in their wigwam temple, in the wilderness of America, enjoy more of God's presence than the most righteous Jew could enjoy in that house of which David had rather be a door-keeper than to dwell in the tabernacles of men. And all this too, when God's only house of prayer, according to his covenant with Israel, stood in Jerusalem.

V. Malachi, the last of the Jewish prophets, commanded Israel to regard

the law of Moses till the Messiah came. And Moses commanded them to regard him till the Great Prophet came. But Nephi and Smith's prophets institute ordinances and observances for the Jews subversive of Moses 500 years before the Great Prophet came.

, VI. Passing over a hundred similar errors, we shall next notice his ignorance of New Testament matters and things, The twelve Apostles of the Lamb are said by Paul to have developed certain secrets which were hid from ages and generations, which Paul says were ordained before the world to their glory—that they should have the honor of announcing them. But Smith makes his pious hero Nephi 600 years before the Messiah began to preach, disclose these secrets concerning the calling of the Gentiles, and the blessings flowing through the Messiah to Jews and Gentiles, which Paul says were hid from ages and generations "which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto us, the holy Apostles and Prophets, by the Spirit: that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." Smith makes Nephi express every truth found in the writings of the Apostles concerning the calling and blessing of the Gentiles, and even quotes the 11th chapter of the Romans and many other passages before he had a son grown in the wilderness able to aim an arrow at a deer. Paul says these things were secrets and unknown until his time; but Smith makes Nephi say the same things 600 years before Paul was converted! One of the two is a false prophet. Mormonites take your choice!

VII. This prophet Smith, through his stone spectacles, wrote on the plates of Nephi, in his book of Mormon, every error and almost every truth discussed in New York for the last ten years. He decides all the great controversies;—infant baptism, ordination, the trinity, regeneration, repentance, justification, the fall of man, the atonement, transubstantiation, fasting, penance, church government, religious experience, the call to the ministry, the general resurrection, eternal punishment, who may baptize, and even the question of free masonary, republican government, and the rights of man. All these topics are repeatedly alluded to. How much more benevolent and intelligent this American apostle than were the holy Twelve and Paul to assist them!!! He prophesied of all these topics, and of the apostacy, and infallibly decides by his authority every question. How easy to prophecy of the past or of the present time!!

VIII. But he is better skilled in the controversies in New York than in the geography or history of Judea. He makes John baptize in the village of Bethabara, (page 22) and says Jesus was born in Jerusalem, p. 240. Great must be the faith of the Mormonites in this new Bible!!! The mariners compass was only known in Europe about 300 years ago; but Nephi knew all about steam-boats and the compass 2400 years ago.

IX. He represents the christian institution as practised among his Israelites before Jesus was born. And his Jews are called Christians while keeping the law of Moses, the holy Sabbath, and worshipping in their temple at their altars and by their high priests.

X. But not to honor him by a too minute examination and exposition, I will sum up the whole of the internal evidences which I deem worthy of remark in the following details:—

The book professes to be written at intervals and by different persons during the long period of 1020 years. And yet for uniformity of style, there never was a book more evidently written by one set of fingers, nor more certainly conceived in one cranium since the first book appeared in human language, than this same book. If I could swear to any man's voice, face, or person, assuming different names, I could swear that this book was written by one man. And as Joseph Smith is a very *ignorant* man and is called *the author* on the title page, I cannot doubt for a single moment but that he is the sole author and proprietor of it. As a specimen of his style the reader will

take the following samples—Page 4th. In his own preface:—"The plates of which hath been spoken." In the last page, "the plates of which hath been spoken." In the certificate signed by Cowdery and his two witnesses, he has the same idiom, "which came from the tower of which hath been spoken;" page 16. "we are a descendant of Joseph." "The virgin which thou seest is the mother of God." "Behold the Lamb of God the Eternal Father," p. 25. "Ye are like unto they," "and I saith unto them," p. 44. "We did arrive to the promised land;" p. 49. "made mention upon the first plate," p. 50.

Nephi 2400 years ago hears the saying of a Pagan who lived 634 years after him—"The God of Nature suffers." 51. "The righteous need not fear; for it is they which shall not be confounded," 58. Shakspeare was read by Nephi 2200 years before he was born—"The silent grave from whence no traveller returns," 61. "Your own eternal welfare" was a phrase then common in America, p. 62. "Salvation is free" was then announced. "That Jesus should rise from the dead" was repeatedly declared on this continent in the reign of Nebuchadnezer. And at the same time it was said, "Messiah cometh in the fulness of time that he might redeem the children of men from the fall," p. 65. "The fall" was frequently spoken of at the Isthmus of Darien 2400 years ago.

I had no object, says Nephi, in the reign of Zedekiah, "but the everlasting salvation of your souls," 66. "I had spake many things," "for a more history part are written upon mine other plates," 69. "Do not anger again because of mine enemies," p. 70. "For it behoveth the Great Creator that he die for all men." "It must needs be an infinite atonement." "This flesh must go to its mother earth." "And this death must deliver up its dead," p. 70. were common phrases 2300 years ago—"for the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice upon all those who have not the law given them," p. 81. The Calvinists were in America before Nephi. "The Lord remembereth all they," 85. "The atonement is infinite for all mankind," p. 104. The Americans knew this on the Columbo 2400 years ago. "His name shall be called Jesus Christ the Son of God." An angel told this to Nephi 545 years before it was told to Mary, p. 105. "And they shall teach with their learning and deny the Holy Ghost which giveth them utterance:" this prophecy was at that time delivered against us, p. 112. "My words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth," p. 115. "Wherein did the Lamb of God fill all righteousness in being baptized by water," 118. This question was discussed 2300 years ago. "The baptism by fire and the Holy Ghost was preached in the days of Cyrus," p. 119. "The only true doctrine of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost which is one God without end. Amen," p. 120. This was decided in the time of Daniel the Prophet. "I glory in plainness," says Nephi. "Christ will show you that these are his words in the last day," p. 122. Too late to prove your mission Mr. Nephi!!

"After that ye have obtained a hope in Christ, ye shall obtain riches if you seek them." So spoke Jacob in the days of Ezekiel the Prophet. "They believed in Christ and worshipped the Father in his name," p. 129. This was said by Jacob in the time of Daniel. "Do as ye hath hitherto done," says Mosiah, p. 158. These Smithisms are in every page. "And his mother shall be called Mary," p. 160. "The Son of God and Father of heaven and earth," p. 161. "The infant perisheth not, that dieth in his infancy." "For the natural man is an enemy of God and was from the fall of Adam, and will be for ever and ever," p. 161. This was spoken by King Benjamin 124 years before Christ. He was a Yankee, too, for he spoke like Smith, saying, "I who ye call your king." "They saith unto the king," p. 182. This was another Joseph Smith called Mosiah. "They were baptized in the waters of Mormon, and were called the church of Christ," p. 192. This happened 100 years before Christ was born. "Alma, why persecuteth thou the church of God," p. 222. "Ye must be born again; yea, born of God—changed from their carnal and fallen state to a state of

righteousness," 214. This was preached also 100 years before Christ was born. "These things had not ought to be," 220.

"I, Alma, being consecrated by my father Alma to be a high priest over the church of God, he having power and authority from God to do these things, (p. 232) say unto you, except ye repent ye can in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." 237. "He ordained priests and elders, by laying on his hands, to watch over the church"—"Not so much as a hair of the head shall be lost in the grave"—"The holy order of the high priesthood." p. 250. The high priesthood of Alma was about 80 years before Christ. "The Lord poured out his spirit to prepare the minds of the people for the preaching of Alma, preaching repentance." p. 268. Alma was a Yankee of Smith's school, for he saith: "The light of everlasting light was lit up in his soul." p. 47.

During the pontificate of Alma men prayed thus: "If there is a God, and if thou art God, wilt thou make thyself known unto me." p. 286. "Alma clapped his hands upon all they which were with him." p. 313 "Instruments in the hand of God" were the preachers of Alma. p. 328. Modest and orthodox men, truly!! "If ye deny the Holy Ghost when it once hath place in you, and ye know that ye deny, behold this is the unpardonable sin." p. 332. So Alma preached. "And now, my son, ye are called of God to preach the Gospel." p. 340. "They were high priests over the church." p. 350. "The twenty and second year of the judges this came to pass." p. 364. "They were valiant for courage." p. 376

These are but as one drop out of a bucket compared with the amount of Smithisms in this book. It is patched up and cemented with "And it came to pass"—"I sayeth unto you"—"Ye saith unto him"—and all the King James' *hath*, *dids*, and *doths;* in the lowest imitation of the common version; and is, without exaggeration, the meanest book in the English language: but it is a translation made through stone spectacles, in a dark room, and in the hat of the prophet Smith, from the *reformed Egyptian!!!* It has not one good sentence in it, save the profanation of those sentences quoted from the Oracles of the living God. I would as soon compare a bat to the American eagle, a mouse to a mammoth, or the deformities of a spectre to the beauty of Him whom John saw in Patmos, as to contrast it with a single chapter in all the writings of the Jewish or Christian prophets. It is as certainly Smith's fabrication as Satan is the father of lies, or darkness the offspring of night. So much for the internal evidences of the Book of Mormon.

Its external evidences are, first, the testimony of the prophets Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris; who saw the plates and heard the voice of God; who are disinterested retailers of the books. I would ask them how they knew that it was God's voice which they heard—but they would tell me to ask God in faith. *That is, I must believe it first, and then ask God if it be true!!* 'Tis better to take Nephi's proof, which is promised us in the day of final judgment! They say that spiritual gifts are to be continued to the end of time among the true believers. They are true believers—have they wrought any miracles? They have tried: but their faith failed. Can they shew any spiritual gift? Yes, they can mutter Indian, and traffic in new Bibles.

"But Smith is the wonder of the world." So was the Apocalyptic beast! "an ignorant young man." That needs no proof. Gulliver's Travels is a heroic poem in comparison of this book of Smith. "But he cannot write a page." Neither could Mahomet, who gave forth the Alcoran. "Smith's an honest looking fellow." So was Simon Magus, the sorcerer. "But he was inspired." So was Judas, by Satan.

Its external evidences are also the subscriptions of four Whitmers, three Smiths, and one Page, the relatives and connexions of Joseph Smith, junior. And these "men handled as many of the brazen or golden leaves as the said Smith translated." So did I. But Smith has got the plates of which hath been spoken. Let him shew them. Their certificate proves nothing, save

that Smith wrote it, and they signed it. But Smith gives testimony himself. There is one who says: "If I bear testimony of myself, my testimony ought not to be regarded."

If this prophet and his three prophetic witnesses had aught of speciosity about them or their book, we would have examined it and exposed it in a different manner. I have never felt myself so fully authorized to address mortal man in the style in which Paul addressed Elymas the sorcerer as I feel towards this Atheist Smith. His three witnesses, I am credibly informed, on one of their horse-swapping and prophetic excursions in the Sandusky country, having bartered horses *three* times for *once* preaching, represented Walter Scott and myself as employed in translating these plates, and as believers in the book of Mormon. If there was any thing plausible about Smith, I would say to those who believe him to be a prophet, hear the question which Moses put into the mouth of the Jews, and his answer to it—"And if thou say in thy heart, *How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken?*"—Does he answer, "*Ask the Lord and he will tell you*"?—Does he say "Wait till the Day of Judgment and you will know"? Nay, indeed; but—"When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken; the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: *thou shalt not be afraid of* him." Deut. 18. 8. Smith has failed in every instance to verify one of *his own* sayings. Again, I would say in the words of the Lord by Isaiah, "Bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob: let them bring them forth and shew us what shall happen: let them shew the former things what they mean, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them—shew the things which are to come hereafter, that we may know that you are prophets: yea, do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed and behold it together. Behold you are nothing, and your work of naught: an abomination is every one that chooseth you." Is. 41. 21--23.

Let the children of Mormon ponder well, if yet reason remains with them, the following passage from Isaiah 44, and if they cannot see the analogy between themselves and the sons of ancient imposture, then reason is of as little use to them as it was to those of whom the prophet spake—

"The carpenters having chosen a piece of wood framed it by rule and glued the parts together, and made it in the form of a man and with the comeliness of a man, to set it in a house. He cut wood from the forest which the Lord planted—a pine tree, which the rain had nourished, that it might be fuel for the use of man: and having taken some of it he warmed himself; and with other pieces they made a fire and baked cakes, and of the residue they made gods and worshipped them. Did he not burn half of it in the fire, and, with the coals of that half, bake cakes; and having roasted meat with it did he not eat and was satisfied; and when warmed say, "Aha! I am warmed, I have enjoyed the fire"? Yet of the residue he made a carved god, and worshippeth it, and prayeth to it, saying, "Deliver me, for thou art my God."

"They had not sense to think; for they were so involved in darkness that they could not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts: nor did any reason in his mind, nor by his understanding recollect, that he had burned half of it in the fire, and on the coals thereof baked cakes, and had roasted flesh and eaten, and of the residue had made an abomination; so they bow themselves down to it. Know thou that their heart is ashes, and they are led astray and none can deliver his soul. Take a view of it, will you not say, "There is indeed a lie in my right hand"?

"Remember these things, O Jacob, even thou Israel, for thou art my servant. I have made thee my servant; therefore O Israel do not thou forget me. For, lo! I have made thy transgressions vanish like a cloud—and thy sins like the murky vapor. Return to me and I will redeem thee."

A. CAMPBELL.

February 10, 1831.

THE following letter was written by the congregation of Christ in Wellsburg, Va. some time in the beginning of January, upon hearing that Sidney Rigdon and some of the disciples in the congregation with him had apostatized from the faith once delivered to the saints. Presuming that it may be useful to other societies and individuals who have been troubled by the false spirits which are gone forth from New York, we thought it prudent to give it an insertion. Being written during my absence, and having no date affixed to it, we cannot be more definite as to time than to say it was forwarded by a messenger some time in January last.——*Ed.*

THE church of God which is at Wellsburgh to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ who are at Kirtland: may favor, mercy, and peace, be multiplied to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

We would not have you ignorant, brethren, of the sorrow and sympathy which we have for you, since we heard of the trials and afflictions which have befallen you, and which you are still enduring. For this cause, therefore, and that we might be enabled to stir up your minds, by putting you in remembrance of the favor in which we stand, it seemed good to us, being assembled together in one place, to write to you this letter; and we, also, bow our knees to our Heavenly Father on your behalf, that he may strengthen you with all might in the inner man, that he may preserve you from all evil, and cause you to remain stedfast in the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

You know, dear brethren, that we all were once aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise; that we were alive unto sin, but free men as to righteousness; that we could not call God our Father, and were not his people: that we were foolish and disobedient, serving divers lusts and pleasures; that we were filled with doubts and apprehensions, and were without the blessings and privileges of the gospel. But when our attention was directed to the testimony of God concerning his Son, we did not refuse to set to our seal that God is true. For the glad news of salvation came not to us depending upon human testimony; but began to be spoken by the Lord himself, and was confirmed to us by those who heard him. God himself bearing joint witness, both by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to his own pleasure.

Finding ourselves, therefore, lost, miserable, and ruined, we gladly fled away to lay hold on the hope set before us in the gospel; and believing upon the testimony of his holy Apostles and Prophets, that Jesus is the Messiah, and that God hath raised him from the dead, we were induced, through the goodness of our Heavenly Father, to humble ourselves before his Glorious Majesty; and having made the good confession before men to submit to be buried with Christ in immersion, confessing our sins that we might be raised again to walk in newness of life.

Dearly beloved, we would at all times give most unfeigned thanks to our holy and beloved Father, that he has redeemed us from our

vain behaviour delivered to us by our fathers, not with corruptible things as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Jesus Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot: that he hath quickened us who were dead in trespasses and sins, and hath set us down together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, having freely forgiven us all trespasses. We would ever adore his goodness, that having begotten us by the gospel, the word of truth, through the bath of regeneration, we have been born ot Water and of Spirit—have become his children, and have been introduced into the kingdom of heaven.

And we would continually praise him, that we have been assured of the possession of these blessings, not by men, nor by the word of man, but by the testimony with which he himself has furnished us, that our faith and hope might rest in the word of God, the incorruptible seed, of which we were born, and which lives and abides forever.

How, then, do those that trouble you say, that you should be immersed again? Is there another faith than that depending upon the testimony of those who saw and heard the Lord? Is there another gospel which we have not received, or another Saviour whom we have not acknowledged? Know you not that so many of us as have been immersed into Christ have put him on? And is there, then, another Christ into whom we have not been immersed—another forgiveness which we have not received, or another God whom we have not for a Father? Or has the incorruptible seed of the word of which we have been born, become corruptible and ready to perish? Then, indeed, have we believed in vain, and are yet in our sins. Then, indeed, have we suffered contumely and reproach for the cause of Christ in vain, and in vain have labored to overcome the world and to walk worthy of our heavenly calling. And if we have been heretofore deceived, to whom shall we go? If the testimony of God is not to be believed, shall we believe man? Shall we relinquish the salvation which the word of God assures us we already possess, for any salvation which men may promise? And if the Leader into whom we have been already immersed is unable to guide us to the mansions of the blessed, shall we be led thither by another master?

Dearly beloved, let us be assured that there is not another name given under heaven whereby we must be saved, than the name of Jesus Christ; that no other foundation can any man lay than is already laid; and that if a man or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel than that which we have already received, and in which we stand, and by which also we are saved if we keep it in remembrance, he will be accursed when the Lord comes.

Seeing, then, that we have purified our souls by obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, let us continue in the truth, rooted and grounded in love, and abounding in the work of the Lord at all times. For it is our most reasonable service to present our bodies a living, holy and acceptable sacrifice unto God; of whom we are in Christ Jesus, who has become to us wisdom

from God, righteousness also, and sanctification, and redemption. Though we were some time ago darkness, yet now are we light in the Lord—let us, therefore, walk as the children of light. God our Heavenly Father is light, and in him is no darkness at all. With the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ was the fellowship of the Apostles, who have testified to us what they have seen and heard, that we also might have fellowship with them. Now, if we say that we have fellowship with God, and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanses us from all sin. Let us, therefore, purify ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord. Let us walk worthy of the calling by which we are all called; with all humbleness of mind and meekness, and with long-suffering, supporting one another in love. And let us endeavor to preserve the unity of the Spirit by the bond of peace. There is one body and one spirit as also we have been called to one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father of all, who is in all, and with all, and in us all. For in one Spirit we have all been immersed into one body, and all have been made to drink of one Spirit. By the Holy Spirit we have been enabled to call Jesus Lord. We know his name, and his name is all our trust. Our Father giveth his Holy Spirit to them that ask him; and we have received the Spirit, whose fruits are love, joy, peace, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance; and we know that we have passed away from death into life, because we love the brethren.

What is, therefore, to hinder, brethren, but that we should rejoice in the Lord, and with patience wait his coming? For having received the salvation of our souls, we are waiting for the adoption, that is, the redemption of our bodies. Let us, therefore, in this blessed hope, press forward in the race set before us, ever looking off to Jesus who is the author and finisher of our faith, and who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of God. For all the trials of this present time are not to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed in us. He who has called us is faithful, and his promises shall never fail of their accomplishment.

We beseech you, therefore, dear brethren, by the mercies of God, that you be not moved away from the hope of the gospel which we have received; that you do not forget that you have been purged from your old sins; that you have been born of Water and Spirit, and have already been made partakers of salvation. Be stable and unmoved, and be not tossed and whirled about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men, and by *craftiness formed into a subtle method of deceit:* but be patient, and hope to the end for the glory which is to be revealed. And let us ever continue in prayer and supplication, and abound in thanksgiving to God even our Father through the Lord Jesus Christ who is *the faithful witness*, the first born of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth: who has loved us and washed

us from our sins in his own precious blood, and has made us kings and priests to his God and Father—to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen Behold! he comes in the clouds and every eye shall see him, even they who pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn because of him; yes, so let it be. Let us, therefore, watch, brethren, seeing we have washed our robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Behold! says he, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watches and keeps his garments, that he may not walk naked, so that men should see his shame.

Brethren, pray for us that we may be accounted worthy to stand before him in that day. And may the Lord strengthen you and bless you. May he lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace. We wish you to have this letter read in all the churches who suffer with you. And now to him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or conceive, to him be glory by the congregation for Christ Jesus throughout all the endless succession of ages, Amen.

SIDNEY RIGDON.

IT was with mingled emotions of regret and surprize that we have learned that Sidney Rigdon has renounced the ancient gospel, and declared that he was not sincere in his profession of it: and that he has fallen into the snare of the Devil in joining the Mormonites. He has led away a number of disciples with him. His instability I was induced to ascribe to a peculiar mental and corporeal malady, to which he has been subject for some years. Fits of melancholy succeeded by fits of enthusiasm accompanied by some kind of nervous spasms and swoonings which he has, since his defection, interpreted into the agency of the Holy Spirit, or the recovery of spiritual gifts, produced a versatility in his genius and deportment which has been increasing for some time. I was willing to have ascribed his apostacy to this cause, and to a conceit which he cherished that within a few years, by some marvellous interposition, the long lost tribes of Israel were to be collected, had he not declared that he was hypocritical in his profession of the faith which he has for some time proclaimed. Perhaps this profession of hypocrisy may be attributed to the same cause. This is the only hope I have in his case.

He acted in this instance more like one laboring under some morbid affection of mind, than like one *compos mentis*. He first believed in Smith's three witnesses, and then went to see Smith in pursuit of the evidence. He found ample evidence of Smith's honesty, and returned in the full assurance of faith that Smith is some prophet which was to come. 'Tis true he has not yet found that promise in the book of God which authorized the expectation of Joseph Smith *the junior*, as the restorer of the Jews and the founder of the New Jerusalem. Smith promised the Holy Spirit in its special gifts to all who have faith in his mission. He told them to pray to God and they should know whether he was divinely sent. While Sidney and Cowdery, the Magnus Apollo of Smith, were in conclave in this matter, Sid-

ney yielded to the suggestion to pray. Whenupon one of his fits of swooning and sighing came upon him, he saw an angel and was converted.

He who sets out to find signs and omens will soon find enough of them. He that expects visits from angels will find them as abundant as he who in the age of witchcraft found a witch in every unseemly old woman. I doubt not but that the irreverence and levity in speaking of the things of God, which have been too apparent in Sidney's public exhibitions for some time past, and which he has lately confessed, may yet be found to have been the cause of this abandonment to delusion. The Methodists, amongst whom it appeared so well to take, amongst whom it has recently so much prevailed, ought to be admonished against laying themselves open to such impressions in their swoonings, vociferous ejaculations, and notions about new visions and revelations of the Spirit. The Presbyterians, also, who are for physical operations, may learn the necessity of believing their own Confession of Faith which says that to the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets "nothing is to be added, either by a new revelation from the Spirit, or the doctrines and commandments of men." The number of sceptics and nonprofessors which have believed in the delusions of Mormon, remind me of one of the sayings of Jesus—"I have come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me: if another come in his own name him you will receive."

Most of the disciples of Jesus Christ are in much need of being taught the foundations on which their faith should rest in the sacred writings; and as we are all learning in the school of experience, I trust that the incidents of this year will be useful to all, both teachers and taught, in inducing them to examine with more attention the reason of their faith and hope in God's word. The Apostles had to complain of some whose word, like a cancer, consumed the body of Christ, of some who subverted the faith of others, and it will be well for those who preach that faith if they have not to complain of more than one Phygellus and Hermogenes, of more than one Hymeneus and Philetus.

Mr. Sedwick of Zanesville, and Messrs. Noel and the Chronicle, club of Kentucky, represented this defection as the legitimate result of their phantom "Campbellism." I would ask each of these gentlemen if individually and collectively they would give themselves up in their *moral character*, as a full specimen of the tendency of Calvinism and Fullerism!! So soon as they do this, we may test their system; and may then show that every person who receives the book of Mormon is an apostate from all that he ever professed, if, indeed, he ever professed to receive or value any thing we have ever spoken or written on the subject of christianity.

EDITOR.

OPINION.

UNDER this head we have just read an article in the *Christian Messenger* for January last. The charitable Editor seems to use this

term, "*opinion*," in such a latitude as to cover almost all the laws, ordinances and worship of the christian institution. This would not be a matter so much to be regretted, if he did not make this his *opinion* of opinions a principle of action; and, in fact, give it the sanction of a law. Does any person ask how this can be? I answer, by stating his own case and his own decision of it. He says, "My opinion is that immersion is the only baptism. But shall I, therefore, make my opinion a term of christian fellowship. If in this case I thus act, where shall I cease from making my opinions terms of fellowship? I confess I see no end. But you may say that immersion is so plainly the meaning of christian baptism, you know not how any honest man can be ignorant of it. This is the very language of all opinionists: says one, 'The doctrine of Trinity is so plainly taught that I cannot think any honest man can deny it.' So speak all sectarians respecting their opinions. Shall we reason with them on the impropriety of making their opinions tests of christianity and terms of fellowship, and do the same? Is this consistency? Is this the spirit of reformation? You may say my idea of baptism, as meaning immersion, is not an opinion, but a fact. So say the orthodox respecting many of their unscriptural opinions, and are as firmly persuaded of them as you can be respecting immersion not being an opinion of baptism. Here again a disinterested umpire is needed. The case I shall leave, *sub judice*, till a satisfactory determination of the matter be made." This is his case. But unfortunately the benevolent writer does not leave it *sub judice*, but makes his *opinion* of opinions a principle of action; and therefore exhorts his brethren to commune with *unimmersed* persons, because, in his opinion, the Lord has received them, and, in his opinion, we ought to receive them. "Shall we," says he, "refuse communion with those with whom the Lord communes?"

Here are *three* opinions asserted, and a course of conduct projected and enforced from them. First—It is his opinion that the Lord has received the Paidobaptists, at least the honest Paidobaptists. It is, in the second place, his opinion that we should receive them into christian fellowship: and, in his opinion, they who do not receive them act inconsistently; and hence comes the exhortation to make *expediency*, rather than the *old apostolic usage*, a rule of action. Is this leaving the matter *sub judice?*

To exhort to receive honest Paidobaptists to all the rights, immunities, and privileges of citizens in the kingdom of Jesus, is, as respects leaving the matter *sub judice*, or undecided, as inconsistent as to exhort not to receive them. The Editor of the *Messenger* seems not to regard the exhortation to receive them to be as incompatible with his own reasoning as an exhortation to exclude or refuse them. In one sentence, he who exhorts to receive into christian communion unimmersed persons, however honest, makes his opinion a law of action just as much as he who exhorts to reject them, according to the reasoning of our liberal brother.

But now, as this worthy friend of liberal principles thinks he has left the matter *sub judice*, or undecided, I will beg his attention to a

few remarks on his use of the term "*opinion*," and his rule of action. Opinions are always, in strict propriety of speech, doubtful matters, because speculative. If ever the word be applied to matters of testimony, to laws, institutions, or religious worship, we must be confounded in our faith and practice. If, in his style, *opinion* apply equally to immersion and the doctrine of the Trinity, then it will apply equally to the Messiahship of Jesus, the resurrection of the dead, eternal life, and every item of the christian faith and hope. One man may say, 'I am of opinion that Jesus did not die for our sins; that his death was that of a martyr or witness for the truth of God's philanthropy, and as an example for us.' And another is of opinion that immersion, the Lord's table, and the literal resurrection of the body, are all carnal notions and unworthy of a spiritual man.' Both appear to be honest and pious men. Shall the christian divide the ground with them, and only say *he is of a different opinion?* This is not the charity which rejoices in the truth.

I know that *baptism* means immersion as certainly as I know that *manus* means a hand, and *penna* a pen; or as certainly as I know that *sprinkling* is not pouring, and *pouring* is not dipping. I know as certainly that *eis* means *into*, as I do that *in* does not mean *out*, nor *out*, IN. I believe as certainly the christian facts as I believe any events of the American Revolution. I will not say that he who says he is of opinion that George Washington lived two hundred years ago, and was the same person who is called *Oliver Cromwell*, is to be regarded as a believer of the American history, but only differing in opinion from me. I cannot regard him as only differing in opinion from one who maintains that we are, from the New Testament, as much bound religiously to observe Easter and Christmas, as we are the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper. He may call me *uncharitable*, but I will be *honest* though I hazard his contumely.

But here is the error. We are represented as refusing communion with him with whom God communes, if we do not recognize as a fellow-citizen every one whom God regards as one of his people. Has God any where commanded us to sit down at the Lord's table with a person who refuses to be immersed because he was sprinkled? Or has he enjoined upon me to treat any person as a brother in the Lord because he has recognized him as such, when he fails to keep the ordinances of the Lord? It is only in obedience to the Lord, not on the principle of expediency, but because the Lord has enjoined it, that we are to associate with any person as a brother in the Lord. Nor do I say that none are christians but those who walk orderly; we only say that we are commanded to associate with those only who do walk orderly. If we can dispense with the neglect or disobedience of one christian, we may with another; and so on till we have in the church all the vices of the world.

We are always safe when we act constitutionally, or according to the law of our Sovereign Lord the King; unsafe when we act from our opinion, or sense of expediency, or the fitness of things. He who is so enlightened as to say that *immersion into the name*, &c. is the

only baptism Jesus Christ appointed, and that none can enter into the kingdom of Jesus but such as are immersed or born of water, and yet takes upon himself to set this institution aside upon his own opinion of expediency, presumes more upon his opinion and upon the pliability of his Lord and Master, than we for the universe dare presume. Of all men, he who knows his Master's will, and does it not, is most obnoxious to the displeasure of his Lord.

To say that *a new state of things* has arisen, to which the New Testament laws and usages will not apply, is at once to set aside the perfection and applicability of the book, and to weaken the obligation of every christian institute, and our own hands in waging war against error.

Call not this an opinion; or, if you do, call my belief that Jesus is the Son of God, an opinion too; and every thought, volition, and affection of the heart, an opinion. I trust while our much esteemed friend of the "Messenger" holds this matter *sub judice*, he will not act as if he had decided the matter.

EDITOR.

LITTLE THINGS.

MR. NOEL writes that Campbellism is extinct in Kentucky. The Chronicle publishes and vouches for it. Then it goes to the Vermont Telegraph. Then the Christian Secretary of Connecticut tells it. The Columbian Star, metamorphosed into the Christian Index and political prophet, making some allowance for Mr. Noel's weak side, says it makes "few new conquests whilst some of the ground which had been gained by his (my) errors is now receding from their territory." Deluded by the same cause, R. B. Semple says through the Religious Herald to the Old Virginians, that in Kentucky "strong measures (against reform) have been adopted, and *it is said* to have produced very desirable effects." In New York it is also reported that the conflict is over, and the cause of the priesthood triumphant. By the time it gets back to Kentucky, Messrs. Noel and Chambers believe it themselves, and are willing to quote the Eastern prints that the ancient gospel, which they contumeliously call "Campbellism," is extinct.

If this be the fact, the question arises, By what means has it been extinguished? By argument? No one pretends to say so. By *anathemas* and misrepresentations? Who of the belligerents has fought with other weapons? We have no doubt but that when Stephen was stoned to death and the saints dispersed, the anti-reformers thought their cause very prosperous and boasted of their hard arguments. But when one party uses reason and scripture, and the other *stones*, making their appeal to different parts of the man, and comparing mental convictions and corporeal bruises, it becomes difficult to decide who is most successful, unless we could with accuracy compare mental convictions and corporeal bruises. But nothing can be said with much less regard to truth, than to say that the cause which we plead

is on the wane in Kentucky, or any where else of which we have heard.

EDITOR.

MR. BRANTLY'S PROPHECY.

IN the last Index Mr. Brantly has betaken himself to prophecy as an effectual means of checking the reformation. "We predict, says he, that in a few years what now is known as Campbellism will be merged in the more vulgar corruptions of Universalism, Arianism, Sabellianism, Unitarianism, &c. &c." page 112. The spirit of Abner Clopton had fallen upon him at that moment, and while enrapt he saw things which he could not utter, and finished his prophecy with two *et ceteras!!* EDITOR.

THE RIGHT REV. BENEDICT JOSEPH FENWICK.

THIS Catholic bishop of Boston has been attacked by Dr. Beecher, in a lecture upon Catholicism. The bishop of Boston defends his system just as our opponents defend theirs, by defamation and denunciation. The reader will please compare the following extract with the sayings, and doings, and boastings of Messrs. Brantly, Clopton, &c.——*Ed.*

"The Catholic church, said he, was not like the Calvinist, of yesterday—but of 1800 years. Not as his, the offspring of rebellion against God and man—began in crime, and growing from bad to worse; and containing in herself the seeds of destruction; so that perhaps, as Calvinism is fast breaking up, she may not be heard of in 50 years from this; the Catholic church is the work of God, who has promised to defend her; her commission can only be rightly exercised by her children; Calvinists have no right to expound the scriptures.

"Calvinism is confined to a few spots in the earth; while the Catholic church is spread over all the world, under every form of government, and that in spite of all opposition.

"It is this church which a Calvinist minister has had the temerity to attack, with the expectation of destroying her. Impious hope! Let him examine her history, see the obstacles she has had to combat, and her constant victories, which ought to strike him dumb, and cause him to be silent forever. He here spoke of Christ, his Apostles, and also of the early Christians, and gave a summary of their history to the time of Constantine; and said that the devils complained of Christianity through the mouth of idols. He then spoke of her internal troubles: the bark of Jesus Christ would have been wrecked, had not God held the helm; the children which she had nurtured tore her bosom; they were the more dangerous because unsuspected; the church slept, whilst they matured their plans by artifice and violence. No article of faith, however clear and demonstrative, but what had been attacked. Here he spoke of the ancient heresies—no practice of the church, as praying to saints, praying for the souls of the departed, adoration of images, &c. which had not been assaulted—no opinions,

however absurd, which had not been broached; he spoke of the controversy about images, said the Iconoclasts had dared to break them, and throw them out of the churches; this he reprobated.

"Martin Luther he called a drunken apostate friar, Calvin an apostate monk—said that they raked up all the old heresies: the church received a dreadful shock from this wicked band; and but that God had stayed it, it would have destroyed the church: Her opposers had been violators of the law, corrupters of morals, libertines, &c."

Vermont Telegraph.

ANDREW BROADDUS.

MR. ANDREW BROADDUS of Virginia has addressed a letter through the Herald, declaring a wish to have published in the Harbinger some remarks on the Extra No. 1.—rather soliciting a discussion of the whole matter. Yet he has decided the question by declaring *non-fellowship* with those who say with Peter, "Reform and be immersed every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of your sins." After whipping Paul, a certain gentleman began to inquire what he had done. Our friend Broaddus having secured his flock from conviction by a decree, carrying all his authority, now proposes a discussion. To this we must consent; for "fair play" we cannot expect from the "Powers that be." His condition, however, is, that we make no reply until he has got through. Though this may be a necessary preliminary or an expedient one on his part, I cannot positively promise to do so. This would be very imprudent on my part to make a vow before I see the pieces. I never pledge my word to do or not to do any thing in the dark. Let him forward his pieces and leave them to my judgment and conscience whether or not to reply to his pieces as they appear. I could wish that some person might be deputed to argue this question in whom the anti-reformers have confidence. I think that Mr. Broaddus is more competent than any other person in Virginia. I will afford him every facility which reason and religion will sanction. He is the only person I know of in the Baptist society in these United States who will presume to reason, who has any talent for calm and dispassionate reason, and who will demean himself as an honorable disputant in a question of this sort. All the Editors, Scribes, and Rabbis from my friends Clopton and Brantly down to Garner Mc'Connico and G. Sedwick, vituperate and slander, misrepresent and decree; but even their friends will not say that they can reason or investigate a single position which they impugn.

EDITOR.

TIME-SERVING CLERGY.

WHEN Elizabeth came to the throne of England, only two hundred, in nine thousand four hundred clergymen, were deprived of their office, by a change of the national religion from Popery to Protestanism. In other words' forty-six, in forty-seven of all the clergy of the land, changed their religion with the change of government for pay.

Vermont Telegraph.

From the Christian Index.

THOSE WHO DO NOT READ.

A letter from a distance, in giving a reason why several persons in that region declined renewing their subscription to our paper, says: "Most of our religious community are opposed to Education, and Missionary Societies—and some of them say, the more that is written on religious subjects, the more discord is created." These good people are very fond of peace, when they think that good books and papers must be excluded for the sake of it. *But all colors look alike in the dark.*

UNFAIRNESS.

The notice of many discontinuances has reached us since the beginning of the new year. Not a few of these were dated 31st of December, 1830, and several January, 1831—having from 500 to 1000 miles to travel before they could be received in Philadelphia. The consequence has been that three or four of the Nos. of the Vol. commencing Jan. 1831, had been sent off to those very persons before notice of discontinuance was received. In every such case the whole volume is lost to the concern. One hundred such subscribers will occasion a loss to us of $100. Whereas the year's subscription to them, individually, is only $2. We feel under renewed obligations to those *persevering friends and agents*, who enable us to go on, notwithstanding such heavy losses caused by those from whom we did expect better things. *Christian Index.*

Mr, Brantley has some reason, no doubt, for the above complaints against "*the unfairness*" of his subscribers. We have had a few notices of discontinuance written after the 1st of January. They were in no instance, as far as we recollect, from the known friends of reform. We should, indeed, suppose that our labors were not of much advantage to our readers if, as Mr. Brantley says, "many discontinuances" should have been notified in the manner complained of. If our readers should act thus unjustly, we could not think that they either loved mercy, or walked humby. Our experience for a number of years authorizes us to say, that in proportion as our readers become enamoured with the ancient gospel, they become more punctual in the discharge of their pecuniary obligations, and less disposed to be in debt; and that the believers in physical operations stand most in need of legal operations to make them feel the obligations of common justice. EDITOR.

New Edition of the Journal of Health.—This very acceptable publication may now be procured from its commencement, in one neat octavo volume. The varied and useful matter which it contains will render it an acquisition to all Libraries. It abounds in valuable precepts on the important art of preserving health, and may therefore be regarded as a work suitable to all classes of readers. Its arguments in favor of temperance in every sort of enjoyment are deserving the notice and respect of christians, who, in these things, should set an example for the imitation of all others.—*Christian Index.*

MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER. VOL. I.

F V SUTTON, Bowling Green, Va. paid for L Battaile. M Ellis, Plum Orchard, Ia. for P Shraden, also $1 for H Richardson. I Cross, Cobleskill, N. Y. for himself. I Hardy, Ia. $1. T H Lipscomb, Mt. Pleasant, Va. for Z Billingby, Dr N Terril, J W Harris, B R Todd, and W Rolls. C Cole, New Washington, Ia. for himself. W Poston, Winchester, Ky. for J Chisolm, W Talliaffero, J Bush, J Ashley. R Miller, Richmond, Ky. for himself, O C Steel, S Stone, C Collins, A W Reid, G Brawner, S Harris, W Miller, W Reid, Mr Turner, A R Barronton, and T T Willis. R Hickman, Athens, Ky. C Williams, Col J Mason. S Wheeler, Mt. Sterling, Ky. for themselves. R M Batson, Millersburg, Ky. for himself, T Throckmorton, J Mc'Kim, T Eads, Jos Miller, and James Miller. R R Hunt, Clintonville, Ky. for himself W Young, Paris, Ky. for himself. A Rice, Mt. Sterling, Ky. for W Chambers, J Hopewood, H Wilson, J Stoffer, J Wright, E Smith, H Darnall, J Hansborough, and D Orear. J T Bryan, Owingsville, Ky. for J Briton. J Burbridge, and C Day. D F Newton, Fifes, Va. for E Houchins and J M Vaughan. W H Erwin, Baton Rouge, La. for G Klinepeter, and L Garrison. W Hillyard, Upper Canada, for himself. C Martin, Troy, O. for himself. L Hunt, Huntsburg, O. for himself, and E Clark. J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store, Va. for S Bruce, also $1 for W Doswell. L C Roberts, Lynchburg, Tenn. for himself and J Edde Esq. A R Runyan Esq. Mays Lick, Ky. $24—names not stated. W Pangburn, Middleberry, O. for S Green, and C H Starr. H Elley, West Port, Ky. for himself and W Wells. W Taylor, Milton, Ky. for himself. W Tureman for T C Osbourne and L P Bacon, Nashville, Tenn. and G Corwine and J Bacon, Maysville, Ky. L Cammack, Montgomery, Ky. and S Worthington, Germantown, Ky. J Stump, Port Gibson, Miss. for L Matthews, J Loving, J L Rowland, S Rundill, and J Pate. Matthew Mc'Keever. E Harris, O. for himself. W H Erwin, Baton Rouge, La. for himself and M Noble. W P Wills, Fulton, Mo. for G Ballenger, W Douglass, and A Miller. B Hollis, North Middleton, Ky. for himself. J. J. Pearce, Elyra, O. for himself.

RECEIPTS FOR VOL. II.

F V Sutton, Bowling Green. Va. for H Jones and P Woolfolk. J D Erwin, King Creek, S. C. $1. W Poston, Winchester, $9—names not given. Gen J Garrard, Paris, Ky. for himself. S Hanson Esq Winchester, Ky. for himself—C Williams for himself. R M Batson, Millersburg, Ky. for himself, T Throckmorton, J Mc'Kinn, T Eads, Jos Miller, James Miller. W Young, Paris, Ky. for himself. J Sims, North Middleton, Ky. for himself. B H Payne, Mt. Sterling, Ky. for himself, E C Payne, J N Payne, also vol 3 for E C Payne. J T Bryan, Owingsville, Ky. for himself. C Martin, Troy, O. for himself. S Bruce, Jeffreys Store, Va. for himself. J Mc'Leroy, Hickory, Pa. for himself. R Starr, Wellsburg, Va. for himself. J B Edwards King, Wm. Ct. House, Va. for T Neale. C Mc'Neely, Cadiz, O. for himself. N Nixon, Maysville, Ky. for himself. G Mafford, J Key, Minerva, Ky. for themselves. L Cahil, S January, A Payne, J Holton, W Holton, and A Porter, Mason County, Ky. for themselves. Gen W Clark, Greenville, N C. for himself. M Mc'Keever, Middleton, Pa. A R Runyan, Mays Lick, Ky. for R Ingram of Mt. Carmel, Ky. M P Wheat, Columbia, Ky. for himself and T Botts. N G Smith, St. Lawrence, N. C. for himself. S E Shepherd, Alba, Pa. for W Evans, also $1 for himself. Z Darnall, Greensburg, Ia. $1 for J Saunders. J Anderson, Franklin, Tenn. for himself. J Benton, Leedsville, N. Y. for himself, C Benton, and Sarah Reid. T Poindexter, Hopkinsville, Ky. for himself. P Edwards, Russelville, Ky. for himself. R G Kay, Bucknersville for himself. J D Garrard, Elkton, Ky. for himself. H Ewing, Nashville, Tenn. for himself. J P Sledge, Nashville, Tenn. for himself. E Creel, Greensburg, Ky. for himself, and J Grove. J P Smith, Columbia, Ky. for himself and J T Smith. L Lindsey, Bucknersville, Ky. for himself. T W Coleman, Oak Grove, Ky. for himself. John Adams, Oak Grove, Ky. for himself. A Fulkerson, Perryville, Ky. for himself.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{No. 3.} BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, MARCH* 7, 1831. {Vol. II.}

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

NO. VI.

ON Friday the 10th of December, at seven o'clock P. M. I pronounced an address to the church and citizens of Nashville, introductory to other addresses in contemplation. The characteristics of the present apostacy were compared with the prophetic character of the Man of Sin, and Babylon the Great, as portrayed by Daniel, Paul, and John. The mysteries of "the Mystery of iniquity" were descanted on, and the deleterious influences of the mystic systems of interpretation were noticed. Several positions respecting primitive christianity were exhibited; and at the close it was proposed to have a meeting on the following evening for the purpose of giving a favorable opportunity for a familiar conversation, to such as had any thing to inquire, object, or propose relative to the principles assumed in this introductory address. After the close of the discourse I learned that all, or nearly all, the clergy of the city had attended this meeting. On the next evening at the hour appointed, we found a large congregation assembled. Some objections were proposed through brother J. Creath on the nature of faith, and repentance; and an inquiry on the mystery of the five Calvinistic points was also proposed We attended to the difficulties proposed on the subject of faith, when Obadiah Jennings, now pastor of the Presbyterian church in Nashville, arose and spoke nearly an hour on the popular views of faith as a saving grace wrought some way in the heart by supernatural operations. I replied in a speech of about half an hour. Mr. Jennings then arose and gave us a sermon on the special operations of the Holy Spirit—on true and saving faith contrasted with historic faith, &c. &c. which occupied another hour, and as soon as he ended he left the house, alleging indisposition. We replied to his remarks, examining the prominent passages of scripture cited by him in attestation of his views. Faith as the gift of God—as ranked among the fruits of the Spirit—and the impossibility of the natural man understanding spiritual things, were amongst his strongest proofs of the necessity of supernatural assistance to believe the testimony of God.

David's prayer for the opening of his eyes to understand the law, and the Lord's opening the understandings of his disciples to understand the Jewish scriptures were confidently appealed to in proof of his views. The gentleman seemed not to have noticed that not *faith*, but *the salvation* was the antecedent to *touto*. He appeared not to have noticed that *pistis*, faith, and *charis*, grace, are both feminine; and, consequently, neither of them could be the antecedent to *touto* which is of the neuter gender. Faith is not, then, said by the Apostle to be the gift of God. Nor did he seem to have noticed that faith, ranked amongst the fruits of the Spirit, was *fidelity* associated with temperance and meekness. "To one is given faith by the same Spirit" was also alluded to, without observing that this was faith to work a miracle; for if ordinary faith was given only to one of the spiritual men, the other spiritual men wanted it; a position equally hostile to his views and mine. He did not appear to have apprehended that the *natural* man, spoken of by Paul in his 1st letter to the Corinthians, was contrasted with the *spiritual* man; or, in other words, that the natural man was a Pagan with only his five senses to guide him. That a mere *animal* man, destitute of any oral or written revelation from God, could not have spiritual ideas was cheerfully admitted by me: but that the natural man of the schools was the same with that of Paul was not only confidently denied, but evinced.

This zealous advocate of the incredibility of God's testimony without supernatural assistance, did not appear to have seen how impertinent it was to his purpose to adduce the prayers of David, concerning a discovery of the wondrous things couched in the ancient oracles to prove that his *natural* man could not admit the testimony of God. Neither did he regard the discrepancy between the Lord's opening to the minds of the Apostles the ancient prophecies, and his pleadings for supernatural aid to believe that God spoke the truth. But his ardor to defend the dogmas of the elders had doubtless led him into these very palpable mistakes; and heated by a zeal to maintain what he had taught, he appeared reluctant to yield opinions so much at war with revelation and experience.

He was, indeed, honest enough to allege that faith was the belief of testimony, and that faith and testimony are correlate terms. He also protested aganst physical influences; but yet contended for some sort of mysteries in religion, neither as I could learn in accordance with Catholic or Protestant mysteries; but a sort of intermediate mysteries. The mystery of iniquity he disowned, but the mystery of godliness was yet a secret in some sense which he failed to make me understand.

His second speech being a repetition of his first one somewhat enlarged and amended, and the lateness of the hour, together with his precipitate retreat from the house, forbade my enlarging upon the topics. A few remarks illustrative of the entire inapplicability of his proofs to his positions, closed the scene.

Lord's day morning, after the celebration of the Lord's death, I lectured on Ephesians, fourth chapter, viz. the one Lord, one body,

one Spirit, one God, one hope, one faith, and one immersion. Descanted on the many lords, bodies, spirits, gods, hopes, faiths, and immersions of distracted christendom, and contrasted these with the seven units. Ten persons came forward, and confessed the Lord, whom I immersed in the Cumberland River. An immense crowd witnessed the immersion.

In the evening we returned to the church. After delivering an address to those who had that day owned the Lord, I spoke the word of the Lord to the whole congregation. Another exhortation was tendered, after which three persons came forward to vow allegiance to the King. The night being dark and wet and the river at some distance, they were immersed at sunrise the next morning by brother Creath.

On Monday evening we lectured again on John, third chapter, and examined the doctrine of the new birth—descanted on the kingdoms of nature, grace, and glory, in the popular acceptation of these terms; and on the next day left the city to visit Franklin and Columbia—farther in the interior of the state. Brother P. S. Fall accompanied me. During our absence, brother Creath delivered several addresses and immersed two persons.

In Franklin we found ourselves among the icebergs of Calvinism. Garner Mc'Connico who has sublimated every thing in religion, except the practice which is yet *carnal*, is the bishop of this diocess, and lives unfortunately within three miles of the town. To help the matter, the thermometer got down nearly to zero, and even below it, an unusual degree of cold for that place. We tried to speak in the Baptist meeting-house, which had a stove without a pipe to it. We were first smoked out of our eyes, and then chilled out of our feelings; just emblems of the system of things ecclesiastic in that diocess. The next day we retreated to the Presbyterian meeting-house, in which were two stoves and their appendages. But some of the windows were out. An effort to warm the house under such circumstances, was as fruitless as Fullerism; which, while it displays great generosity in the beginning, is in the end as churlish as Calvinism. Too homogeneous was this house; for the heat created by the stoves passed out through the windows above. The congregation was chilled in body, soul, and spirit. On our return through this place, we tried the Episcopalian meeting-house which is the masonic hall. It, more candid than the others, had no pretensions to heat; for there was neither stoves, nor pipes, nor fire-place of any sort visible to the naked eye. So we found the doctrine of correspondences according to the Baron Swedenborg true for once, in the flourishing village of Franklin, Tennessee. We were very courteously treated by several citizens of this place, amongst whom were Mr. Olmstead, Robert Foster, Esq. and the physicians of the town. But while Calvinists in faith, the citizens of this place appear to be Arminians in the affairs of the present world. In raising cotton the prophet Mc'Connico is not a Calvinist; but in converting souls the work is altogether God's. Good works, too, are not to be depended on, neither can evil works

flustrate infrustrable grace. This is said to be his unfeigned faith, and the people are unworthy of credit, if he be a hypocrite.

In the Baptist meeting house we spoke of trying the spirits; in the Presbyterian house we descanted upon the cloud of witnesses to the power of faith as a principle of action; and in the Episcopalian house upon the 1st and 2d chapters of the Epistle to the Colossians on translation into the kingdom of Christ from the kingdom of Satan; and on the fulness, power, and majesty of the King of Saints. But no person could be induced to enlist under him.

In Columbia we found a large assembly. Brother Fall, on Saturday evening, addressed them on Paul in Athens. On the Lord's day we spoke in the forenoon on the salvation of the Gentiles, and after night on the same subject. After much exhortation, three persons only had the faith which we required; and at sunrise the next morning we immersed them in Duck River, in the environs of the town. This water had not been moved in a similar way for some years, or perhaps, ever before; and although the hour was so early, many of the citizens attended, and many seemed to be convinced that this was the ancient gospel and order, but they lacked courage or confidence to own the Lord. The Methodist society, so generally distinguished for liberality, afforded their meeting house; while the Presbyterian pastor, and two of his elders, kept a larger house comparatively empty, much to the dissatisfaction of his own people and the citizens generally. Sundry persons who came a great distance could not get within hearing at the Methodist house.

On Tuesday the 21st, returned to my relatives in the vicinity of Nashville, where I spent two or three days in writing for the Harbinger. On Friday evening delivered a lecture in Nashville in reply to two questions, viz: 1st. How did the Lord Jesus establish his religion in the world? 2d. By what means did he determine to perpetuate it in all time coming? The congregation was large, and as usual, attentive. Mr. Jennings appeared, taking notes as before. We repeated the invitation formerly given, and proposed the next day, being Christmas, to hear objections.

On Saturday morning we met, at ten o'clock. After reading a portion of the history of the planting of christianity, of the disputes, reasonings, and discussions of that age, from Luke's Acts of Apostles, brother Crea'h prayed. To prevent such an appropriation of time as occurred on a former occasion, I had the precaution to call a gentleman to preside over the meeting, and to stipulate that twenty minutes only should at one time be occupied by any one speaker. Dr. Felix Robinson, as impartial an umpire as the city could afford, accepted the request.

Mr. Jennings soon arose, and began a defence of the sects from the severe condemnation he represented me as having pronounced upon them. He apologized for the "evangelical sects," as very innocent, unavoidable, and in some respects necessary and useful things. He said there were sects amongst the Grecian and Roman Philosophers; sects amongst the Jews; and that there must be, as Paul said,

sects or heresies amongst Christians. Some sects were worthy of being denounced, but the orthodox sects could not be, as I had stated, ranked amongst the works of the flesh. There were good christians in them all, especially in the "evangelical sects;" and how reprehensible must he be who represents sects, as such, as doomed to the vengeance of heaven. Mr. Jennings spoke with much charity and apparent feeling on this subject, and appeared the very benevolent apologist for his good Methodist, Episcopalian, Quaker, and Regular Baptist brethren. He appeared to be all love and tenderness, bowels of compassion for these necessary, useful, and *good evils.* His sage appearance and fine Presbyterian voice, with a very evangelical tone, drew forth the grateful sympathies of all sectarians who supposed themselves embraced in all the "good words and fine speeches" of this no sectarian Presbyterian. Unfortunately for me I had read the history of the Puritans of Old and New England, and the Blue Laws of Connecticut—the groans and sighs of the whipped and gibbeted Quakers and Baptists, and all the movements of this orthodox sect in pursuit of the civil sword, with the active use they made of it while they had it, were passing in review before me, and prevented me from enjoying a morsel of this rich repast for the hungry Methodists, Episcopalians, and Calvinian Baptists, who seemed to swallow it without chewing. This subject engrossed two or three of his speeches.

In reply, I urged such facts as the following —That Paul had represented divisions amongst christians as equivalent to a literal dividing of Christ—and the assuming the name of a factionist, as equivalent to representing that factionist as crucified for his followers, and his followers as immersed into his name; that *sects* were ranked by the same Paul amongst the works of the flesh, and classed with murder and adultery, and that most of the wars and bloodshed of modern Europe, and a great majority of all the envies, jealousies, and bickerings in families and neighborhoods, arose from this cause; that the anathemas of Heaven were denounced, not only upon the Mother of Harlots, but upon all her daughters; and that the plagues of God were threatened to them who would not come out of this Sectarian Babylon.

A difference between those who are leaders and those who are led was admitted. The leaders were shewn to be factionists, and the led, frequently, without suspecting it, their aiders and abettors. The identity between the factionist and the heretic whom Paul denounces was alluded to; and his admonition to the Romans, to "receive one another without regard to differences of opinion" was urged, to shew that differences of opinion might exist amongst christians while they are one body and of one faith.

Mr. Jennings accused me of being a factionist, and shed a few *dry tears* over the divisions amongst the Baptists. Some of the opposers of reform present sighed an *Amen* to this imputation. He even accused me of being the head of a party. His remarks reminded me of the charges against Luther for rending the seamless coat of Christ, and for destroying the integrity of the Holy Apostolic Church. These

aspersions were shewn to be unfounded. The motto to every number of the "Christian Baptist" was a witness against him. And the impossibility of building up a sect while we admitted only the constitution and laws of Christ's kingdom as authoritative, and allowed perfect liberty to private judgment without excision, was demonstrated. In one sense of the word party, or sect, the kingdom of Jesus would be a sect or party so long as there were Jews, Mahomedans, or Pagans, on earth. In this sense only could our views and practices be denominated sectarian. So long as we excluded from the kingdom of Jesus only those who would not acknowledge him to be Lord by doing the things which he commanded; so long as we made our own opinions private property, and required no person on pain of excommunication to adopt them, we might be calumniated by a classification with other sects, but could not be shewn to be sectarian.

Mr. Jennings next attempted to sustain his pretensions to being one of God's called and sent ministers, by urging the necessity of a *special call*, and alleging that the Apostles taught the necessity of both "*the call to preach*," and ordination to qualify for administering ordinances. He said that he agreed with all the views presented in my discourse the evening before on the means by which christianity was originally established and to be perpetuated, except in what pertained to this "*call and ordination*." He relied principally upon Ephesians, fourth chapter, and on the commission to the Apostles, as proof of this special call; and on the letters to Timothy and Titus for ordination. The Presbyterian arguments for a sort of apostolic succession and the necessity of official authority, were informally advanced. Several speeches were made on this question, evidently to the great detriment of his special call, and to the jeopardy of his authority with the people. 'Twas on this occasion that my worthy opponent learned, if not before, to guard against being "land-bound," as sailors would say. From this moment he put to sea, and only touched upon the coasts of foreign countries, never entering a single harbor.

The incredibility of the special call from the contradictory messages delivered to men by those who equally pretended to, and proved their special call by the Holy Spirit, and apostolic succession, was briefly exposed. The more ignorant the preacher the greater the pretence to the call, was now become an adage. The world had not yet decided whether Swedenborg, Fox, Calvin, Wesley, or Gill, had the strongest plea for being called and sent by the Holy Spirit. That they all could not be sent by God needed no proof; and that any one of them was specially called or sent by him, none of them could prove. The only call which any man could urge with either scripture or reason on his side, was his competency to instruct, and the need for it. The same call which the rich man has to relieve the poor when he discovers them, is that which an intelligent christian has to instruct those ignorant of God. All the texts adduced by Mr. Jennings were examined, and the fact *that no man was ever ordained by the Apostles to break or consecrate the loaf, or to immerse or sprinkle*, was urged without an effort on his part to adduce an exception—un-

less we could consider his quoting the phrase "the bread which *we* break" as applicable only to the Apostles. But his denying that he was a successor of the Apostles, and his not attempting to sustain this phrase as spoken of the Apostles breaking the loaf, forbid us supposing that he could find an exception. His asking for an example of a *layman's* baptizing or breaking bread was replied to by a reference to Philip's immersing the Eunuch, Ananias immersing Paul, and to the fact that the Apostle Peter commanded the six Jewish brethren who accompanied him to Cesarea, (for there were no other disciples present,) to immerse the Gentiles. The coming together of the disciples to break the loaf at Troas, was adduced to shew that the celebration of the supper required no *official* hands nor consecrated heads—and the fact that in all the qualifications for the office of bishop and deacon, and in all the exhortations tendered to them, not a hint or allusion is found intimating that they were appointed for that purpose. That all christians are made kings and priests to God under the great king and high priest of our profession, was also enforced. That the idea of official power or holiness coming from the imposition of hands, was the kernel of Popery; and that, if Mr. Jennings and the Presbyterians contended for the right to administer ordinances, because of ordination, then they derived it from the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition, because they had no other ordination than what Calvin had received: or, if they had, it came from a layman; were propositions which Mr. Jennings would not discuss. When he plead that a man's *desire* for the office of a bishop was a special call to the work, he soon discovered that this would prove too much for him; for it would include myriads of enthusiasts and other unqualified persons, because proportionally of these there is a greater number who desire the office than of those qualified for it. With this discovery Mr. Jennings abandoned that point, and with it ended any thing like a discussion on Saturday.

'Tis true he read and commented on some extracts from his manuscript sermons on Divine operations in true conversion, and became quite a critic on the new version. *Immersion*, too, as the import of *Baptisma*, and the extracts from Dr. George Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, appended to the new version, were topics which he named. He even professed to criticise some phrases in the new version, and represented Dr. McNight as a formalist, because a *dry* preacher. His object appeared to be to excite the prejudices of the people against every thing but Presbyterianism, and therefore, like the wounded Parthian, he shot his arrows behind him, flying from point to point. With him it was Point Look-out, and Point Look-in, Point, No-point, and Point again.

After spending the evening till nearly ten o'clock in this latitudinarian style, the worthy gentleman let us know that he had much more to say, and was sorry that my appointments forwarded through Kentucky prevented a continuance of the conference the next week. At this moment I informed the gentleman that if he would select any one proposition, the most important he could select from all that he had

read or heard from me, and pledge himself to discuss it according to the established rules, submitting to be controlled by a competent tribunal, I would hazard the meeting of my appointments and continue in the city till Tuesday morning. He consented, as a matter of course, but did not then give the proposition, though the Moderator suggested the propriety of furnishing it in writing. Determined not to tarry on Monday unless a proposition of some sort, affirmative or negative was presented, I requested through some of the brethren, who waited on him next morning, a proposition. He sent me in writing the following: "*To be born again—What is it? and the effects thereof?*" This being one topic, and expecting that as he had pledged himself to give one proposition he would have no objections to affirm or deny something about it, and thus convert it into a proposition, I consented to wait till Monday, and on the Lord's day made the appointment.

On the Lord's day morning at ten o'clock, the disciples came together to break the loaf as they are wont every Lord's day. Feeling assured that Mr. Jennings' efforts were designed to check the spirit of enquiry still increasing in Nashville, to hang up the public mind in suspense, and thus to prevent a favorable hearing, I called the attention of a very large audience, on the Lord's day, to the remarkable coincidences in the history of the three great leaders of men sent by special commission from God—Moses, John, and Jesus. The attestations given to each, and the adaptation of their credentials to the persons over whom they were called to preside, were first noticed. This placed in a forcible point of view before the mind the peculiar signs and proofs of the mission of each afforded to those whom they congregated. The promises and threatenings which each leader had to offer, constituted the *second* topic. That each of these three leaders made all their disciples pass through water, was the *third* topic. The immersion *into* Moses, in the cloud and sea—John's immersion *into* reformation—and the immersion of all who acknowledge Jesus as a leader *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were illustrated in the details.

The discourse, occupying two hours, was followed by an exhortation to submit to the last and greatest leader and commander of men, Jesus the Messiah, because of the promises he had to offer. Sixteen or seventeen persons came forward and submitted themselves to the Lord Jesus as their leader. After sermon I immersed them in the Cumberland River *into the name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, according to the command of Jesus. They were united to the congregration in the evening of the same day, and addressed for some time on the new relation into which they were brought, with all the duties and privileges attendant thereon. The brethren in this congregation generally came forward and saluted the new disciples, by giving them the right hand of fellowship, and congratulating them on their adoption into the family of God.

After the address we again spoke to the whole audience on the cloud of witnesses to the power and excellency of faith, as the great prin-

ciple of action under the reign of the Messiah.—We adjourned till Monday morning at ten o'clock.

At the hour appointed, Mr. Jennings attended. He chose Mr. Hays, a Presbyterian Theologue, as his Moderator—I requested brother Foster, formerly Speaker of the Senate of Tennessee, to act for me. These gentlemen agreed to invite Mr. Payne, a Methodist teacher of celebrity, to preside. They took their seats. I informed them that I had not yet got a proposition from Mr. Jennings, but only the subject of a proposition, without any predicate. Mr. Jennings at first demurred against giving me any thing save the topic already mentioned; but being reminded of the pledge he had given on Saturday evening, he attempted to draft one. But so it came to pass that we could not get any definite proposition from Mr. Jennings till one o'clock. I proposed to defend any one of the ten propositions in the Extra, on remission of sins, if he could not draft one to meet his views and to comply with his pledge. At length he chose a paragraph with four propositions in it, refusing to discuss any one of the ten. I told him to engross those four propositions into one and I would accept it. He said it could not be done. We then presented them engrossed in one, proposing if there was one idea in the paragraph not engrossed, we would on his suggestion add it. After some examination he declined it, making no other objection than that he did not like it. He then gave me the following: "*To be born again and to be immersed is not the same thing.*" I was constrained to accept this awkward proposition or to have no discussion. I observed that if he would, to save debate, admit that the term *regeneration* in Titus, 3 and 5, was equivalent to "*being born again*," in his sense of the phrase, and would have it appended to his proposition in writing, I would accept it. He did so. The Moderators then adjourned till three o'clock.

At the hour appointed we met. Mr. Jennings, though holding the negative, without ceremony arose and spoke his twenty minutes. The uncharitableness of my views, and the consequences flowing from the supposition that immersion and regeneration were two names for the same act, engrossed his first speech.

I appealed to the congregation whether my charitableness or uncharitableness was any proof of the proposition, and whether the gentleman did not endeavor to incapacitate them for examining coolly and dispassionately the question, by an attempt to inflame their passions and arouse their prejudices. I shewed from his own confession of faith, from the article on the decrees, how illy it became him to talk about the charitableness of systems, and concluded by shewing that the discussion was by stipulation to be confined to the mere question whether *the term* regeneration was used in the scriptures as equivalent to *the term* immersion. He arose and renewed his remarks on charitableness, and on the decrees, and brought in, among some local matters, a tale about some of the reformers laying too much stress on water. Mr. Payne, the presiding Moderator, called him to order, and stated the irrelevancy of such matters to the question at is-

sue. He then spoke of the new birth as spiritual, and on immersion as incapable of changing the heart.

We replied to his remarks on the decrees by reading the article in the Creed without note or comment, and observed that we would not notice any thing he might say on any topic save that agreed upon.

We then stated the affirmative of the proposition, and shewed the different acceptations of the terms *to be born again.* Regeneration having been agreed to be equivalent to being born again, it was immaterial in the discussion which term we used. We then shewed what ground was covered in the popular acceptation of the term, and what in the biblical import. In the popular import regeneration included the quickening, the receiving of the spirit, a change of heart, and being born. In the scriptural import it denotes only the act of being born; for the washing of regeneration is contrasted with, or, at least, distinguished from, the renewal of the Holy Spirit. We then spoke of the begetter, the impregnation of the mind by the word of truth, and of the act of being born of water and of spirit as distinct matters. We also noticed the deception practised by our opponents in representing us as including in our usage of the term all their ideas of regeneration, and then in representing us as including all their views in our sense of the act of immersion: Whereas we contended that a child is begotten and made alive before it is born, and that regeneration, in scripture acceptation, meant neither more nor less than the act of being born of water, which my opponent had already conceded, inasmuch as he had said that regeneration, Titus 3d & 5th, meant being born again; and that Paul had associated the idea of *water* with regeneration, inasmuch as he spake of the washing or bath of regeneration.

Mr. Jennings spoke of the necessity of a change of heart, as essential to the idea of being born; and descanted upon such phrases as "create in me a clean heart, renew in me a right spirit;" of "the opening of the heart;" of the natural enmity;" of the incapacity of "the natural man;" of the import of the discourse with Nicodemus; and attempted to shew that to be born of water was a figurative expression, and some way not distinctly stated as equivalent to being born of the Spirit. He spoke of the necessity of supernatural aid in the common sense, though not physically, but spiritually; and closed by moving an adjournment.

I opposed the adjournment, as too soon, and insisted upon replying at least before an adjournment.

Mr. Jennings then urged his plea, assigning indisposition. I then consented, and the Moderators declared an adjournment till seven o'clock.

The house having filled to overflowing, we ascended into the pulpit, and resumed the discussion. My friend, having filled his Testament with two or three manuscript sermons, soon recovered from his indisposition. I thought his pen was swifter than the tongue of a ready writer, if, during the recess, he had not only indited but written out so many pages. But the miracle was explained to me by

those who heard him deliver two discourses on regeneration shortly after the appearance of the "Extra on Remission." Seeing him well furnished with materials, I resolved to confine myself, and him, if possible, to the insulated topic; and therefore resumed the discussion by alleging that it mattered not what views might be entertained upon the subject of previous causes and previous changes, the question was, What does *the term* regeneration import? He had said that the Spirit did not operate physically; it must, therefore, operate morally, and if morally, then water and the word must be the instruments: and, accordingly, Paul had taught that the church was cleansed by a bath or washing of water and the word. But although different views of previous changes and their causes might be entertained, still it mattered not; the question was not what preceded regeneration, but what is regeneration? It was represented by me as the act of being born, and if my opponent understood and regarded the import of his concession on Titus 3d, he must feel that he had decided the cause against himself: for if the washing of regeneration was equivalent to being born again, and if the washing of regeneration was different from the renewal of the Holy Spirit, then, unless he could shew some other use of water than the baptismal, it must follow that the only time the term regeneration occurs in the New Testament applied to a person, it is used as convertible with, or equivalent to, immersion, which was the only question before us.

I observed that I would not rely upon the fact, though it was the highest human authority on the subject, that all antiquity for the first 400 years *unanimously* used the term regeneration in this sense as convertible with baptism; yet I relied upon the scriptures alone, and then proceeded to John 3 & 5, and examined it.

Mr. Jennings in three or four speeches touched on the following topics—He remarked that these writers had used these terms as equivalent, but this was in the age of darkness. He argued that the Holy Spirit did not act physically nor morally, but *spiritually*. He descanted on Titus 3d & 5th, and John 3d & 5th, as figurative expressions; and shewed that the operations of the Spirit were frequently compared to water. He cited and commented on, or rather read from his sermons, several passages from both Testaments on the figurative application of water, and extolled spiritual regeneration. He thought that I followed the figure of being begotten and quickened before born, too far—represented the darkness anterior to the new birth, and the light into which we were introduced at the first birth, as the only legitimate use of the figure of being born again. He also assumed that persons might in his sense be born again and not baptized, and baptized and not born again. He descanted upon the impossibility of water, of itself, washing away sin, and the danger of relying upon immersion—emphasised upon the necessity of the blood of Christ, and read some passages in the "Extra" which he compared to the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In reply, we shewed that if "born of the water" was figurative, "born of the Spirit" was figurative too, and illustrated the tendencies of

such liberties with the Sacred Scriptures. We descanted upon the use of the term *begotten* in the Epistles of John & Peter; on the fact that water always preceded in the Apostolic style "the word," and "the spirit," when they occurred in the same passages. We shewed that the primitive writers were not classed by any authority with the writers of the dark ages. Mr. Wall's declaration that all antiquity considered John 3 & 5, and Titus 3 & 5 as referring to immersion, was next considered. We shewed the unmeaning subterfuge of representing the Spirit as operating neither physically nor morally, but spiritually; for if we act *humanly* when we act physically and morally, the Spirit must act spiritually when it acts morally or physically. We read an extract from the Presbyterian Standard of Theology, written by Timothy Dwight, in demonstration that "the essence of enthusiasm consisted in relying upon spiritual communications for knowledge and disposition, and that no such communications exist in fact"—Next presented to the congregation the fact that Mr. Jennings not only departed from all the rules of interpretation agreed upon by his own commentators, but positively contradicted his own confession of faith, in his remarks on John 3 & 5, and Titus 3 & 5. Here we read from the confession the application of these two passages to baptism by the Westminster Assembly, and shewed that Mr. Jennings, in his mysticising, equally opposed his own creed and myself on this occasion.

As to the possibility of water washing away sin by its own intrinsic influence, we had as little faith as our opponent. We regarded the imputation as a calumny. We regarded faith, the name of the Lord, or the blood of Christ, and water, as all necessary; and shewed that this was a foul slander. What God had joined together, we presumed not to separate—Jesus had said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and, "Unless a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." "Confession with the mouth, and believing with the heart," were joined by Paul as necessary to salvation; and he that separated them presumed to sit as a god in the temple of God. We left all to judge whether we or our opponent acted most wisely; we requiring faith, the blood of Jesus, and water, as necessary; or he that dispensed with such of them as he pleased.

After reading some extracts from the Extra, vindicating it from the aspersions of my zealous opponent, and the Moderators having agreed upon the time of adjournment, we concluded our address, and the discussion closed.

Mr. Jennings deserved some credit for his tact in managing his resources. He had so much management as to keep something else before the mind of his audience than the real subject of debate. He was always combatting some deadly heresy, and guarding his audience against the contagion of error. He has a considerable talent for relating anecdotes, and his long practice as a lawyer has left yet upon him the scars of the profession. He compared himself to David with his sling, and myself to him who had defied the armies of—

John Calvin; and, indeed, he was much more adroit in slinging stones than in submitting his premises to the scrutiny of reason or revelation. He never came within the confines of logic, and his practice as a textuary has eminently disqualified him for a judicious application of scripture. The Presbyterian notice of this discussion published in the "Whig and Banner," as far as it goes, is as *impartial* as we could have expected; but that of Whitsitt. (the Baptist) which appeared in the Chronicle, is like its author, out at every corner. He was not present, and presumed to inform his brother the Chronicler of that which he neither heard nor saw. The Regular Baptists, as they call themselves, would have rejoiced if Mr. Jennings could have sustained one of his objections, as they did in the failure of W. L. McCalla to prove his infant baptism. Indeed they are more willing now to fraternize with the Presbyterians than with us. The Tract Missionary, Mr. McAboy, after enjoying a good salary for a year or two as itinerant knight for the Tract establishment, has thought good to secure one for life by actually joining the Presbyterians. His example will be of use to his brethren.

To dismiss Mr. Jennings for the present, we would only add that it unquestionably was his object, in availing himself of an opportunity tendered not for such purposes, to prejudice the community against the reformation, to secure his own flock from defection, to discuss nothing, but to create doubts and difficulties where there were none, and to bewilder the public mind with the mysteries of human invention. In this he was not quite so successful as he expected, for more than *thirty* persons confessed the Lord and vowed allegiance to him, in the different intervals of his opposition.

EDITOR.

THE CHURCH IN NASHVILLE.

THIS Congregation, before the late additions, was reported as consisting of about 250 members. By the labors of brother P. S. Fall, an able and efficient advocate of the Apostles' doctrine, sustained by the intelligence and assiduous efforts of several faithful brethren and fellow-helpers of the truth, this congregation has been purged from much of the traditions of the fathers of sectarianism, with only the loss of *five* persons, who have recently withdrawn from them and formed an alliance with the factionists Whitsitt and McConnico.—These inconvertible remains of orthodoxy, which sat like an incubus on the brotherhood desirous of honoring the Ambassadors of Heaven, have happily for the cause of truth worked themselves off into a little sectarian fraternity, enlivened only by the feeble pulsations of metaphysical life, and animated with the hope of being justified by a righteousness imputed to them, to which, they say, they are not entitled from any thing inherent in themselves.

This christian congregation is so far advanced in the reformation as to meet every Lord's day, to remember the Lord's death and resurrection, to continue in the Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, breaking of bread, and in prayers and praises. From its location, in

the capital of the state, this society has already exerted, and is likely still to exert, a happy influence over the whole state. Like the congregation in Rome in that Empire, may their faith and piety be spoken of throughout, at least, the whole state of Tennessee!

The spell of a specially called and sent army of textuaries to murder the Holy Scriptures has been broken in Tennessee; and never again will that population tamely submit to the degradation of having to eat the minced pies of any religious confectionary, or to be fed upon the broken dough from the kneading trough of Pharaoh's chief baker. But, indeed, they have not hitherto been so well used. They have been, like birds in a cage, fed upon the crumbs of him who has imprisoned them, and meted out their portions so long as they would sing for him.

The three best specimens of the textuary system which I had the opportunity to hear, were the proofs adduced by Mr. Jennings for metaphysical regeneration, by Jeremiah Hubbard, a famous preacher among the Friends, whom I heard in Bowlingreen, and a Mr. Jacobs, a Calvinian Baptist, whom I heard in Maysville, Ky. They both agreed in the necessity of a mystic supernatural agency in the production of a belief in the testimony of God. Friend Hubbard was the fullest of the three in his quotations. Differing nothing in his main proposition, nor in the manner of quoting the scriptures, from Messrs. Jennings and Jacobs, he simply excelled them in the *number* of his quotations. Words were thrown together which had no more religious affinity than *Judas* Iscariot and *Judas* the brother of James. Peter, and Magus the sorcerer, were both called *Simon;* and as well might the ignorance and impiety of the sorcerer be ascribed to the Apostle, because they both occasionally appropriated the same name, as to apply nine texts in every ten of those quoted to sustain the incredibility of God without mystic impulse, to the purposes of these pretenders to a secret communication of either wisdom or power from God to believe.

The following is a fair sample of the texts quoted to prove that God cannot be believed unless his Spirit work faith into the heart:

"*My Brethren*—As Jesus Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, so must all his children be born of the Spirit before they can exercise true and saving faith. Unless, then, the Holy Spirit come upon thee, and the power of the Highest overshadow thee, that holy thing called faith cannot be wrought in thy heart. For as Elihu said, "there is a spirit in man;" and "the Spirit of the Lord has given me understanding"—and "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" for holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. "The things of the Spirit are spiritually discerned," and "there is a manifestation of the Spirit given to every man, to profit withal. To one is given faith by the same Spirit," and the fruit of the Spirit is faith, which is also called the gift of God; for "he opened the heart of Lydia," and made the Apostles understand his meaning: and Paul saith, "you are his workmanship, created unto good works"—for "except a man be born of the

Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and God has shined into our hearts to give us the light of this knowledge," and "therefore as many as were ordained to eternal life believed;" for "my sheep hear my voice;" therefore you believe not, because you are not of my sheep"—"all thy children shall be taught of God"—"every one that has learned of the Father cometh unto me;" and "no man can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him." "Thou hast revealed these things unto babes," "for flesh and blood has not revealeled it unto thee, but my Father who is in Heaven." "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit;" and "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him." "But you have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit of God"—"how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious"! "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." "The Spirit divideth to every man severally as he will"—and there is "but one Spirit"—"God hath chosen you to salvation through the sanctification of the Spirit; and the Spirit will therefore convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment:" and "this he spake of the Spirit which they should receive." Now is not the point fairly proved that no man can believe but he that is first regenerated of the Spirit!!"

Such rhapsodies are called preaching the gospel! and he is a *natural* man who calls them in doubt!

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

"ORDER IS HEAVEN'S FIRST LAW."

WHILE, in the absence of Him whose right it is to reign, the upstart rulers and petty despots of this world are tyrannizing over their unhappy subjects, and watching with intense interest those gloomy and portentous clouds which now darken the political horizon; while the French Revolution, like the writing on the wall which "struck o'er midnight bowls the proud Assyrian pale," intimates to them that they have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting;" while, in the midst of the feast, they have perceived their destiny suspended by a single hair; and tumult, and confusion, blood and carnage, the roar of artillery and the shrieks of the dying are heard on every side, you, Dear Brother, surrounded by rural quiet and domestic peace, and far retired from the arena of political dissension, occupy yourself in the contemplation of the beauties of creation; in tracing the analogies of nature and religion, and exhibiting the order, harmony, and enjoyment, which obtain beneath the government of the Prince of Peace. Blessed indeed are all they who put their trust in Him! Thrice happy they who, finding themselves involved in the disorder and confusion consequent upon the fall of the *first head* of the human family, have returned to their allegiance and adopted as a Leader that glorious One whom God has constituted a Prophet, Priest, and King!

What perfect order and regularity we discover in those parts of the universe which have never departed from the laws originally delivered to them by the Creator! What beauty is exhibited in the still night by the azure canopy which glows above us, spangled with stars! These glorious orbs, sparkling with undiminished brilliancy though ancient as the sun, have continued to know their appointed course, and to perform all their revolutions with the utmost precision. With so much exactness indeed do these immense bodies go through their various movements, that the astronomer for months, nay years before, can foretell to the minutest division of time, even to the very instant, when their anticipated changes and eclipses shall occur. No deviation of a planet from its orbit has struck a sun from its centre and carried ruin and dismay amongst a thousand worlds. Against the dominion of their Author they have never rebelled. To Him the bands of Orion have ever yielded, and He has controlled the sweet influence of Pleiades. He has brought forth Mazzaroth in his season, and He has guided Arcturus with his sons. The orb of day has continued to issue like a bridegroom from the glowing chambers of the East, and like a strong man has rejoiced to run his daily course. He knoweth also his going down. Nor has the moon forgotten when to display her silvery crescent, nor when full orbed to steal the radiance of the starry host. The earth, also, has still experienced her appointed alternation of seasons. Does the husbandman tremble for his sown fields when the hoary frost of heaven binds up the soil in icy fetters? Or does he despair when winter's snows bury the hills and vallies and all the works of man in "one wild dazzling waste"? Has smiling spring ever failed to unbend the frozen glebe? Has glowing summer neglected to clothe the earth with verdure? And when did the sower not enjoy his harvest-home?

But when we turn from scenes like these of harmony and peace to contemplate man, for whose benefit this beautiful order has been instituted, how striking and how melancholy is the contrast. The head has fallen, and long has the body been struggling in the dust! Adam proved incompetent to govern himself, and he was not fit to be the king of men. Accordingly, the human family, deprived of a Leader, yet feeling the need of government; laboring under a consciousness of guilt, without a Priest to mediate and to atone; and ignorant of the character of God, without a Teacher to reveal it, have, in their vain endeavors to supply their wants, delivered themselves up, from days of old, to the dominion of cruel kings, the influence of wicked priests, and the delusions of false prophets.

Here we see a vain Xerxes, in the impotency of his rage, chastising the unruly waves and casting a chain into the sea, while millions follow him to slaughter and destruction. There a deified Alexander is slain by the cup of Hercules—but the kingdom is not yet given to "*the most worthy*." Here a Nero and a Tiberius vainly strive to glut themselves with human misery and carnage; and there an Alaric leads forward his conquering bands to devastate the fairest portion of the globe. At one time a voluptuous Heliogabalus is seen at the head

of an Empire, and at another the world trembles at the name of Napoleon the destroyer. Now, men idolize a tyrant; and again, revolting from a king, they put themselves under the power of a numerous band of legislators, and instead of the follies of *one* are willing to endure the absurdities of *many*. How nation has been arrayed against nation by ambitious leaders, state opposed to state, city to city, and man to his fellow! How, in short, beneath the sway of the oppressor under the title of King, Protector, Sultan, Emperor, Satrap, Bashaw, Czar, or Dictator, we discover the human family in every age naked, dishonored, imprisoned, manacled and bleeding!

And if such ill success has attended the endeavors of men to procure for themselves a head worthy to govern, how entirely incompetent have they been to select an acceptable Mediator! Acquainted, we would suppose, with their own character, if they have failed to obtain a ruler to please themselves, could we expect them to find an intercessor who would please God, of whose nature and attributes they were so ignorant as to compare to the creatures of his hand, to four-footed beasts, and creeping things, the invisible Creator who is God over all and blessed forever? What cruelties have been practised, and what preposterous sacrifices offered, with a view to atone for transgression, and to propitiate an offended Divinity! Here, under the direction of the priests of Chronus, we see mothers forgetful of all the tenderness of their nature, making it a merit to witness without a groan their infant offspring cast into the flaming statue of that idol, and with kisses and embraces hushing the cries of their children, lest the efficacy of the sacrifice should be lost by an appearance of reluctance and regret! There the blood-stained wheels of the car of Juggernaut meet our eyes, where the land is strewed with human bones whitening in the sun, and where dogs and vultures are fed by the hand of superstition; "for there is no pity at Juggernaut, there is no tenderness of heart in Moloch's kingdom." Now we meet a miserable pilgrim on his way to Mecca, or straying far to seek "in Golgotha him dead who reigns in heaven:" and again, an unhappy votary of Shion is seen, hoping to appease his god by swinging in the air upon hooks fastened in his flesh. At one time a Curtius, devoting himself to the gods Manes for the safety of Rome, leaps into an unfathomable gulph; and at another, a patriotic Codrus bleeds to satisfy the tutelar deity of his country. But time would fail to speak of the penances and mortifications extorted by false priests to placate directly or indirectly an offended God; the whip of St. Francis, or the discipline of St. Dominic; the stool of repentance; the intercession of Friars, Popes, and pretended Saints; their pardons, indulgences, bulls, and all their trumpery.

Nor is it required to range the fields of ancient Mythology to exhibit the unworthy ideas which have been delivered to man by false prophets respecting the character of the Supreme Being. We do not need to speak of the loves and battles of the heathen deities, the voluptuous paradise of Mahomet, the dreams of Eastern Brahmins, or the fancies of the ten thousand religious visionaries who have led the

world astray. Their own conduct has sufficiently displayed their views of the Divine character. The horde of vile and barbarous divinities with which they have overspread the world from the regions of eternal frost to India's coral strand, or the burning sands of Africa, prove the degradation into which they have plunged the human family. Here men have been taught to offer sacrifice to the trunk of a tree—there, the pedal with which rice is beaten is raised to godship. In one country paying divine honors to the river Ganges, they consider it the most acceptable offering to drown themselves in its waters. In other regions they worship serpents, and bow down before the beasts of the field; they pay adoration to monkies, bones, the teeth of elephants, and the feathers of birds. And just in proportion as the character of God (the true standard of perfection) has been lowered, in the same degree has the character of man himself been degraded. Apis brutalized his worshippers, and the example of Priapus could produce no purity. Bacchus and Venus were patrons of debauchery and lust; and the Bacchanalia of Greece, and the Aphrodisia of Cyprus were their schools. What a flood of vice and immorality has issued from this source and deluged the world! How has it been filled with violence, rapine and murder, by pretended messengers of God! It is not necessary to detail the slaughters of Mahomedanism, or to lift the curtain from the scenes of the Inquisition: suffice it to say, that false priests and false prophets have involved men in miseries and crimes at which humanity shudders. Professing to be governed by the God of peace and goodness, they have waged wars of extermination; and, fiercer than the hyena, have delighted in torture—have arrayed nations against each other, and engaged them in all the horrors of religious persecution.

What a melancholy picture, then, does the human family present! What confusion, what disorder prevails! What diversity in religion, government, morality, law, manners, and customs! What national peculiarities, antipathies, discords, feuds, and jealousies! No communion, no harmony, no uniformity among men. And how unable have they been to deliver themselves from their oppressors! Like the fabled Hydra, presenting the appearance of a many-headed monster, if the steel of a Brutus have crushed an imperial Cæsar, an Anthony and an Octavius have instantly sprung up to rivet the chains of despotism; if the strong arm of popular indignation has here dethroned a tyrant, innumerable leaders have plunged the state into anarchy and ruin. Thus has it ever been, and thus will it ever be until the Avenger, coming in the glory of his strength, shall sear the nations with a flaming brand!

But let us turn from the contemplation of the miseries and divisions of the human family, to enquire for a moment their cause. And since we have seen that peace and harmony have been preserved in those parts of the universe which have not deviated from the laws originally delivered to them, we can impute the disorders of mankind to no other cause than this, that they have departed from the order in which they were originally placed by the Creator; that man has forsaken

the principles which were delivered to him at the beginning. "He put forth his hand and did eat." Here we behold the true source of error! The spark that hath set the world on fire! The small seed which, darting its roots deep into the earth, has stretched its vigorous arms to the skies, and seems to bid defiance to the storms of heaven!

The substitutes which men have sought out shew their need of a true head, as false coin proves the poverty of its possessor. Had they not felt their want, they would not have endeavored to supply it. Had they not been sensible that they had sinned, they would not have recognised the necessity of atonement and intercession; and had they not known themselves ignorant of God's character, they would not have sought for teachers to reveal it. And it would ill become any one, to infer from the ill success which has attended the attempts of mankind to procure a true guide, that such an one has no existence. The existence of a counterfeit proves the existence of something genuine. For a counterfeit is predicated upon a previous knowledge of that which is true, and derives its success from the confidence already placed in that of which it is merely the appearance. Have men, then, usurped the power of God, and sought to free themselves from his authority? Have they paid to others the homage due to him? Has Satan deluded the world by means of false gods, false kings, false prophets, and false priests? Here we might rest the argument and argue from these very facts the certain existence of a Living and True God, a glorious King, a true Teacher, and a holy Priest.

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set MY KING upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my SON, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise therefore, Oh! ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."

How eminently fitted must the Son of God indeed be to supply the wants of the human family. Acquainted with the order, beauty and perfection of the government of the universe; possessed of the power, glory and wisdom of his Father, and knowing what is in man, how well qualified must he be to rule the nations of the earth! Unlike the first Adam, he withstood the temptations of Satan and shewed his capacity to govern, being himself unconquered. The mighty one who has overthrown the proudest monarchs he overcame; and having tri-

umphed over sin, death, and satan, the heavens have acknowledged him as worthy to receive riches, and honor, and power, and glory, and blessing; and when he comes to claim the kingdoms of the world, he will be revealed in his glory as the King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Vain mortals have claimed the honors of the Deity, and have aped his power. The treacherous sandal betrayed the mortality of Empedocles, and the imitative thunders of Salmoneus and Caligula could not save them from retributive justice. But when the King of Kings comes, the trump of God shall announce his presence; the trembling earth shall own her rightful Lord, while they that are in their graves shall hear his voice; the government shall be upon his shoulders—and then, dear brother, we shall have a joyful day!

He is also constituted a Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedeck. A sacrifice of nobler name and richer blood than the Lamb of God could not be offered up to atone for the sins of man, and to exhibit to them the justice and mercy of the Author of their existence. As the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same. As he was tempted, he knows how to succor those who are tempted—and what more prevalent intercessor is there with a Father than a beloved Son? As a Prophet, who can equal him who is perfect in wisdom, who knows all things, who is the First and the Last? He spoke as never man spoke. He possessed the riches of knowledge and understanding. What beautiful thoughts compose his discourse! What ennobling sentiments, what sublime views of God and nature he has delivered! In the midst of an age of darkness and of ignorance, in his teachings we behold nothing unworthy of infinite perfection; nothing derogatory to divine wisdom; nothing incompatible with the divine character. All is simple, all is pure, all is peaceable, every thing calculated to happify the condition and exalt the character of man. But who shall speak of his perfections? Who shall display the glories of Him who is the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the exact image of his substance; who upholds all things by the word of his power; who hath light and immortality dwelling in him?—To whom be glory now and forever. Amen.

ALUMNUS.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

11. WE now come to consider the business of ruling, and the passages of scripture which the clergy have translated so as to suit and support their pretensions to spiritual domination.

The business of government or ruling has, in modern times, been divided with great propriety into three branches, happily enough distinguished and designated by the epithets Legislative, Judicial, and Executive. Anciently, however, and even when the New Testament was written, all these branches were claimed and exercised by one and the same functionary. It belonged to his office to enact laws, to investigate their transgression, and punish their violation. When Christ determined to erect and organize his *spiritual* kingdom on earth, he selected and employed twelve honest friends to publish,

along with other information, the laws which he had enacted and committed to them for publication; laws by which he designed that all his subjects should be governed to the end of time; and moreover, which, for the purpose of rendering them fit to answer this important end, he caused to be reduced to writing, and thus rendered permanent, visible, and transmissible to all parts of the world to the last generations of men. These laws we now find in Christ's statute book, *the New Testament*, where they were at first enrolled, and where they are still presented in their original purity. The legislative branch, then, of Christ's government, continues to this day and forever will continue to be, exclusively in his own hands. To take from, to add to, or to alter in any respect his laws, has been confided to no mortal man. To attempt, then, a change even of the slightest kind, is a manifest usurpation of Christ's legislative prerogative; a flat denial of his capacity and right to legislate for man; a contemptuous rejection of his sovereignty. It tells him and all intelligent creatures that he either wants the information and the feelings which a legislator ought to possess, or that he has no right to prescribe laws to the human family. But though Christ has not thought proper to delegate his legislative right to any human being, and though he has threatened to inflict on the presumptuous wretch who shall dare to usurp the exercise of it the most awful punishment, yet he has confided the exercise of both the judicial and executive branches to the prudence, discretion and fidelity of his brethren the saints. Mat. xviii. 17.—1 Corinth. v. 4.—2 Corinth. ii 6. &c. &c. But if the legislative branch be still retained by Christ himself, and the exercise of the judicial and executive branches be delegated by their sovereign to the saints, what part, I ask, of Christ's government or business of ruling has been reserved as a patrimony for the clergy? As to the scriptural terms on which they rest their pretensions, when correctly translated, they yield no support. The primitive and strict meaning of *proistemi*, which the clergy have translated *rule*, or, *are over*, (Rom. xii. 8.—1 Thess. v. 12.—1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12,) is, I stand forward, occupy the first place, am ahead of others, step forward: but for what purpose? For the purpose of ruling, that is, of prescribing rules, and enforcing obedience to these rules by power and authority, by the terrors of a brandished rod and imperative threats? Or for the purpose of guarding and protecting from moral danger, from the danger of apostacy and supineness, by the influence of example, expostulation and counsel, or as Paul himself explains it, for the purpose of taking care of the house of God? As to the term *hegeomai*, which the clergy have translated by their favorite term *rule*, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24, its primitive and proper acceptation is still more remote from the work of *ruling*. It signifies, I lead the van, I stimulate or urge on by the example set, by the motives I propose, by the admonitions I give. But to lead, stimulate and urge on his fellow-travellers, is the bounden duty of every saint, but particularly of those aged persons in whom their fellow christians have reposed so much confidence as to constitute them inspectors and guardians of the sentiments and morals of the rest.

12. The saints are alone qualified to perform Christ's service and build his body, because they alone possess the knowledge and dispositions required in the performance of this work. With them alone is the knowledge of man's intellectual, moral and legal condition; of God's attributes, designs, purposes and offers; of the Saviour's person, dignity, character, feelings and offices; of the Spirit's personal dignity and functions; of the prospects, motives and inducements which sacred writ presents to stimulate and encourage perseverance; of the malignity and deformity of sin, or disobedience to the commands of God; and of the innumerable difficulties, discouragements, temptations and trials with which the christian is daily and hourly beset, to be found; and of course, that knowledge which, when imparted, can alone make others wise to salvation. But further, the saints alone feel that attachment, that sense of obligation and gratitude to their Redeemer, which is necessary, absolutely necessary, to render his friends active, zealous, patient, and persevering in his service.

13. The saints are, one and all of them, qualified to perform the service which their Master has assigned them. For all of them, possessing the information and feelings which are necessary to secure to themselves eternal life, they can undoubtedly, in a plain and familiar, if not in a pompous and formal way, tell what they know and feel to all around as opportunity may permit. And every believer, every saint, and every friend of Jesus Christ, has his circle of relations, acquaintances, neighbors, friends, and occasionally strangers, to whom he may, whenever he pleases, communicate what he knows of their perishing condition and absolute need of a Saviour, and of the perfect sufficiency and infinite willingness of our most gracious and glorious Redeemer to rescue them from impending vengeance, from everlasting ruin; and to bring both their bodies and minds into a state of the greatest perfection and happiness.

14. Christ's service is a personal trust. He has entrusted the building up of his body to the saints *personally*, and they have no authority to attempt its delegation, or to hire substitutes to do their work for them. Nothing can be more at variance with the spirit and design of the christian institution, nothing more pernicious to the Redeemer's cause, than the prevailing system, that has so long prevailed. Can any thing be more absurd, more incredible, than the fancy that Christ should, after qualifying and commanding every one of his friends to do his work personally, permit them to abandon its personal performance and entrust it to hirelings and substitutes? And what has produced the deplorable, the loathsome, the disgusting spectacle which christendom has long presented and now presents—the children professedly of the same Father, the subjects professedly of the same Sovereign, the friends professedly of the same Benefactor, the promoters professedly of the same glorious cause, torn into countless factions, sects, creeds, confessions and communions, into bodies and individuals, continually fighting, wrangling, abusing and vilifying one another—what has, I ask, produced this mournful, this distressing,

this horrible sight, but the hireling system? Never could this wretched spectacle have been exhibited to the derision, disdain, alienation and ruin of an astonished, ignorant, thoughtless and deluded world, had every professed friend of Jesus Christ performed *personally*, with the love of his God in his heart and his fear before his eyes, his just share of his Master's work devolving on him. Incalculable have been the faithlessness and criminality of Christ's professed friends in this matter. They have basely, cowardly, and treacherously declined the performance of their duty themselves, and committed, to their own immeasurable loss, as well as the irreparable injury of their Master's cause, his work into the hands of hirelings and substitutes: an act of perfidy which has produced for nearly seventeen hundred years all the most lamentable effects already noticed, and *many others*, as every one, in the least acquainted with church history, or who has even attended to passing events, well knows. Were every saint to perform diligently, *in his own person*, his just share of his Master's work, to the entire disuse of hirelings and substitutes, what a glorious change would soon arise! We should soon behold the splendid era, foretold by ancient seers, realized before our astonished eyes: we should see the wilderness and the solitary place enjoying a crowded, a pure, and a joyful population; the desert rejoicing and blooming as the rose: we should see it blossoming abundantly, rejoicing even with joy and singing: we should see the glory of Lebanon given to it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon: nay, we should behold the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God, even his own most glorious intellectual and moral character, the most lovely and the most august of all sights, spread over it.

15. The saints have not only the information necessary to enable them to perform their Master's work with dignity and success within their own minds, but they have an infallible medium or instrument of communication provided and prepared for their use, and actually put into their hands, externally, even God's own unadulterated, unmixed message, contained in sacred writ. No saint, who uses, and relies on this instrument of religious instruction *alone*, when he attempts to impart religious information to his fellow creatures, can fail to convey truth, saving truth, and nothing but saving truth. Thus, then, completely qualified within and without to do his duty, and perform his Master's work, why should the timid, the seduced believer decline its performance? Why betray the sacred, the all-important trust, so confidentially reposed in him, and hire a substitute to do that for him, which honor, interest, duty, obligation, profession, gratitude, justice, and character, require him most urgently to do in his own person?

16. The saints have derived their qualifications to perform their Master's service, not from poring, for years, over the profane remains of heathen historians, divines, priests, and moralists; not from geometrical demonstrations, and algebraical calculations; not from the dogmas of schoolmen, those metaphysical hair-splitters, who infuse impenetrable darkness into all they touch; not from the sophistical,

unintelligible wrangling of contentious and contending Doctors of human divinity, those cobweb spinners, who wrap up the plainest declarations in the book of God, in such a mass of homespun, that no mortal sagacity can unravel it; not from theological seminaries, the prolific, filthy hotbeds of sophistry, error, prejudice, nonsense, and faction; nor from the hereditary faith, or recent belief of parents, relations, neighbors, or friends, infused into the infant mind, as yet unable to judge whether the information offered be true or false; but from the unadulterated oracles of the God of truth. From these *alone* is the religious information *directly* received, which the saints attempt through the *very same inspired words of sacred writ* to impart to their fellow-men: and thus are *they* effectually guarded from communicating error; nonsense, or falsehood, instead of divine truth.

17. The great command, "Go and proclaim the good news to every rational creature," Mark xv. 15. can, consistently with common sense, be addressed to none but the saints. Surely no thinking being can imagine that God ever commanded any of his creatures to undertake an office, or attempt to do an action, for the performance of which he was not previously qualified. To the saints, therefore, as being the *only* persons who are qualified to perform it, must this command and all the actions comprehended in it, be restricted, and on each of them as being qualified for its performance, is its execution binding. Indeed, it would be perfectly absurd to suppose that Christ commanded any other than qualified friends to engage in his service, or that he forbade any of them to do so. Shall it be told, that because Paul, whom Christ miraculously qualified, and commissioned, in conjunction with his other Apostles, to organize, and, while they lived, to govern his kingdom on earth, occasionally selected and appointed under the infallible direction of that miraculous gift called discerning of spirits, persons to act as deputies or agents under him, where and when he could not attend himself; I say, shall be told, that uninspired men, who have no such gift or commission, and who of course are entirely unqualified to make a safe selection, have a right to determine the latitude of Christ's command, and confine its execution to such characters as they choose to select and approve, thus arrogating to themselves the office and authority of an inspired Apostle? The pretension is absurd. Paul, as an *inspired* teacher, can have no successor but the inspired oracles of the New Testament; and as a governor, judge, or administrator, as a selector and appointer of subordinate officers and agents, no successor, but the christian community, to which, in common with all other societies, the right of selecting and appointing its own officers necessarily belongs. We are, then, utterly at a loss to conceive how uninspired, unaccredited, and, of course, self-created usurpers of the rights of the christian community, could or can acquire a right to select and appoint either associates or successors. The practice is a barefaced usurpation of the rights and privileges of God's children, and a manifest subversion of Christ's arrangement.

18. That the saints, with God's instrument of religious information

in their hands, are equal to their own edification, and the religious instruction of others, or, in scriptural language, to the building up of the body of Christ, is reduced to certainty, both by experience and the testimony of sacred writ. Of the passages, however, which assert this interesting fact, I shall mention only a few:—John vi. 45. Rom. xiv. 19. Col. iii. 16. 1 Thess. iv. 9—v. 11—14. Heb. v. 12. 1 John ii. 27. In Hebrews the persons addressed are blamed because still unable to teach; but why blame them for not acquiring a capacity to perform a work, which they were not at liberty, if capable, to execute? Can any thing be more absurd?

As connected with the preceding reflections, it appears that a more particular examination of the firmness of the four grand pillars on which the clergy rest their pretensions to the exclusive exercise of a spiritual despotism over Christ's family, namely, the *clerical call, ordination*, assumption of the honorable and discriminating titles, bestowed by God on his inspired and accredited servants, and the right of reorganizing Christ's kingdom, is absolutely necessary. This investigation, however, must be deferred to another occasion.

PHILALETHES.

PROPHECIES—*NO. VII.*

IN our preceding essays, it has, we doubt not, been stated with sufficient clearness and supported by undoubted scriptural argument, reason, and innumerable references, that the Jews will in their unconverted state return to Canaan; and there, after the resumption of their nationality, be assailed by the powers of the earth *en masse*; when on a day, called the *Great Day of the Lord*, Jesus Christ shall descend to Mount Olivet, &c. &c. This is the day which, like a curtain, divides the present tragic, from the future triumphant, and millennial part of the *drama* of christianity. For christianity, like virtue, must finally triumph.

Before, however, entering upon our third proposition, let us look at a few more of the circumstances relative to the Jews in their land, on this side of the great line of demarkation on this side the "*Day of the Lord*"—before the introduction of the Millennium.

The land of Judea forms comparatively but an inconsiderable portion of political territory, extending North and South along the South corner of the eastern shore of the Mediteranean about 200, and running back East about 160 miles. Within its boundaries the tribes were at first settled without regard to regularity, or to the mathematical configuration of the country; but when it shall be resettled, this will not be the case: for the Prophet Ezekiel, after marking out the external boundaries, subdivides the whole into portions, running in regular stripes backwards from the great sea to the eastern line. Dan, Asher, Naph hali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Reuben, and Judah, being awarded the first seven, and Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun, and Gad, the last five portions in this partition of the land. But between the seven tribes North, and the five tribes South, is reserved a portion of territory, called the "*holy oblation*," or offering which is described as follows:—chap. xl. 8.—"And by the border of Judah from the East side to the West side, shall be the offering which they shall offer of five and twenty thousand reeds in breadth, and in length as one of the *other parts* from the East side unto the West side; and the *sanctuary* shall be in the *midst* of it. The oblation which ye shall offer unto the Lord, shall be of five and twenty thousand in length, and, of ten thousand in breadth; and for them, even for the priests, shall be this holy oblation toward the North, five and twenty thousand in length, and toward the

West, ten thousand in breadth, and toward the East, ten thousand in breadth, and toward the South, five and twenty thousand in length; and the *sanctuary* of the Lord shall be in the midst thereof. It shall be for the priests who are sanctified, of the sons of Zadok; who have kept my charge, who went not astray when the children of Israel went astray, as the Levites went astray. And this oblation of the land that is offered, shall be unto them a thing most holy, by the border of the Levites. And over against the border of the priests, the Levites shall have five and twenty thousand in length, and ten thousand in breadth; all the length shall be five and twenty thousand, and the breadth, ten thousand, and they shall not sell of it, neither exchange nor alienate the fruits of the land, for it is holy unto the Lord. And the five thousand that are left in breadth over against the five and twenty thousand, shall be a profane place for the city for dwelling, and for suburbs, and the city shall be in the midst thereof. And these shall be the measures thereof:—the North side, four thousand five hundred, and the South side, four thousand five hundred, and the East side, four thousand five hundred, and the West side, four thousand five hundred, and the suburbs shall be towards the North 250, and towards the South 250, and towards the East 250, and towards the West 250; and the residue in length over against the holy portion, shall be ten thousand eastward, and ten thousand westward, and it shall be over against the oblation of the holy portion; and the increase thereof shall be for food unto them that serve the city, and they that serve the city shall serve it, out of all the tribes of Israel. All the oblation shall be five and twenty thousand—by five and twenty thousand ye shall offer the holy portion four square with the possession of the city. And the residue shall be for the princes, on the one side and on the other side of the holy oblation; and of the possession of the city over against the five and twenty thousand of the oblation, toward the East border, and westward over against the five and twenty thousand, toward the West border over against the portion of the prince; and it shall be the holy oblation, and the sanctuary of the house shall be in the midst thereof. Moreover, from the possession of the Levites and upon the possession of the city being in the midst of that which is the princes between the border of Judah and the border of Benjamin, shall be for the Prince."

Thus, in the midst of the oblation for religious and political purposes, 25 thousand reeds, perhaps about 25 miles square, is reserved while the remainder goes to the support of the Prince. The city is to be built with twelve gates named after the twelve tribes, and in size round about 18 thousand measures, and the name of the city from that day shall be, "The Lord is there." We ask the historians of the world, Has such a disposition and settlement of the land occurred? No—never.

The tribes being thus settled in the land of their fathers, and their city and temple rebuilt, the Scriptures of the Prophets afford us many pleasing pictures of the prosperous condition of the nation,—trade and commerce shall return once more to that interesting portion of the globe, and the villages, towns, and cities of Palestine become again the mart of nations until the world stirred up against them shall assemble in the holy land and there be destroyed on that eventful day, when the *new age* will commence and false religion and bad government come to a perpetual end.

Perhaps it may both please and instruct the reader to know the manner in which the settlement of the Israelites in their own land and most of the prophecies are handled by the spiritualizers. The Rev. M. Henry, as he is commonly styled, says, "In this distribution of the land we may observe—

1. That it differs very much from the division of it in Joshua's time, nor agrees with the order of their birth or their blessing by Jacob and Moses. Simeon here is not divided in Jacob, nor is Zebulun a haven of ships—a plain intimation that it is not so much to be understood *literally* as *spiritually*. Though the *mystery* of it is very much *hidden* from us.

2. That the tribe of Dan which was last provided for in the first division, is first provided for here—thus in the *gospel* the last shall be first.

4. That every tribe in this *visionary* distribution had its lot assigned it by divine appointment; for it was never the intention of the *gospel* to pluck up the hedge of property and lay all in common.

5. That the tribes lay contiguous; a figure of the communion of churches and saints under the gospel government.

6. That the sanctuary was in the midst of them;—those of the same parish or congregation! says this Rev. Dr. meeting together should have their hearts knit together in love." Thus the Rev. M. Henry first says we must understand it spiritually, and finally calls it a visionary land.

But to go on with the Jews after their re-settlement in Canaan—the following quotation affords a pleasing outline of their prosperous condition when all the tribes get home:—

Jeremiah xxx. 17. "For I will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds, saith the Lord, because they call thee an *outcast*, saying, "This is Zion whom no man seeketh after. Thus, saith the Lord, I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling places; and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof; and out of them shall proceed thanksgiving, and the voice of them that make merry; and I will multiply them, and they shall not be few. I will also glorify them, and they shall not be small: they shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me: and I will punish all who oppress them; and their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me; for who is this that engages his heart to approach me, saith the Lord; and ye shall be my people and I will be your God. Behold the whirlwind of the Lord goeth forth with fury, a consuming whirlwind; it shall fall with pain upon the head of the wicked. The fierce anger of the Lord shall not return until he have done it and until he have performed the intents of his heart. *In the latter days ye shall consider it.*" Again, iii. 10. "He that scattereth Israel will gather him and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock; for the Lord hath redeemed Israel and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he; therefore, they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock and of the herd, and their souls shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together; for I will turn their mourning into joy, and comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow; and I will satiate the soul of the priest with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith the Lord. Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that the city shall be built to the Lord, from the tower of Hananeel to the gate of the corner. And the measuring line shall yet go forth over against it, over the hill Gareb, and shall compass about to Goath. And the whole vallies of the dead bodies and of the ashes and of the fields unto the brook of Kidron unto the corner of the horse-gate toward the East shall be holy unto the Lord. It shall not be plucked up nor thrown down *any more for ever.*

We see from the above that on the restoration of their nationality the Jews are to become independent and choose their own governors; the arts of peace are to be restored, and the city to be built, and extended greatly beyond its former limits. How do the hearts of all the righteous long for the accomplishment of these things—and these things must shortly come to pass—the note of preparation has been given. The nations, as now seen in the present state of Europe, are approaching a crisis from which they cannot retreat—there is a "bridle in their jaws causing them to err"—they must, therefore, continue to approach the precipice until they tumble over it to eternal ruin. Revolution must succeed revolution, with all the accompaniments of war, famine, and ruin, until he comes whose right it is to reign, and to him the government shall be given.

We are now waiting for that event which shall open the way for the return of the children of Israel; perhaps, however, the late revolution in France is that event. Perhaps the Consistory of Paris may in its wisdom *deem* it fit shortly to order the scattered remnants to hold themselves in preparation to march for the land of their fathers. The Lord will perform it in his own due time. Blessed be the name of the Lord!

There is an immense number of Jews in Poland. The late revolution there, together with the disturbances in other parts of Europe and of the world, will very possibly stir up this degraded people to some new measures. Perhaps the Grand Turk will invite them shortly to take possession of Judea, for Mahometanism will flourish to the *time of the end*, and at that time will conspire with other nations against the Jews. The Turk is fond of improvements, and more liberal than his predecessors. In the Apocalypse, France, because it runs through the Catholic countries, from one sea to another, is styled the *Street*, i. e. of Religious Babylon; and when the sixth vial is poured out, it is upon the river Euphrates. Perhaps this indicates the German empire, which flows through the whole extent of the Roman Catholic countries, from the Baltic to the Mediteranean. The vial is for drying up the waters to prepare the way for the conquering party, whoever that shall be. By drying up the waters may be meant the detaching of the petty chiefs from the thraldom of the emperor and the consequent ruin of his kingdom. But who are the conquering party? "The kings of the East." Time alone can interpret this scripture. Some think the Christians are meant—some think the Jews. It is a fact, however, that can be proved from scripture, that the Jewish nation turned to the faith of the Messiah, is appointed to conquer and inherit the world; for there is a promise to their Father Abraham, that his seed should inherit the *world*: perhaps, then, the sixth vial, which is to fall upon the German empire, will make way for the Jews; and, as vast hordes of them are contained within its boundaries, the consideration renders the supposition not the less probable. But we will wait patiently for the salvation of the Lord, whose "eyes are upon all their ways." The fifth universal empire, viz. that of Messiah, must inherit the world—he must inherit all nations; and the Jews who are to be converted to the faith may possibly be the conquering party, meant by the phrase, "*Kings of the East*. But of this there is at present no certainty: besides it is to be remembered that the allusion is to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus and his uncle, two eastern kings; and as the Catholic countries are the antitype of ancient Babylon the conquering party may possibly be—nay, very probably, are those who are now trying to put down the government and religion of those countries of Europe.

DANIEL.

CHURCH REFORM.

EXTRACT of a letter addressed by CUTHBERT RIPPON, Esq. to Sir ROBERT PEEL, on the subject of Church Reform.

"Tythe is a valuable consideration given in exchange for spiritual assistance. If the price be received, the advantage withheld, the party is guilty of religious swindling. The Parson is the servant of the parish, paid for the performance of certain duties, which in equity he is bound to fulfil. If he neglects or refuses, the contract between the parties is at an end. The appointment of a hireling substitute, without the approbation of the parish, is imposition and fraud—*it is the well-paid physician receiving his fees, and giving up his patients to the care of an apothecary.* What justification can be *offered for* this shameful *concubinage* of duties? * * * * Religion becomes a trade,—its ministers, money seeking men—its chiefs a polit-

ical presbytery—Power sets up its puppet, commands its consecration, vests it in lawn, crowns it with a mitre, and by forgery of language calls it 'Father in God.' But it is a mopsey of mortal make. God will not accept it—man will not respect it; human reason detects the juggle and smiles with contempt on the worldly conjuror."

These remarks deserve to be printed in letters of gold, and circulated throughout the country. They are an Iliad in a nut-shell. There is no omission; no exaggeration; the eloquence is the eloquence of truth; the indignation that of honesty and justice. The Church is precisely what Mr. Rippon has described it, an enormous overgrown establishment, which makes up in temporal, what it wants in spiritual, authority. It has within it all the seeds of rottenness and corruption, as any one may perceive, who will take the trouble to devote a month (if so short a time will suffice) to the summing up of its countless pluralities. What can be said in praise of a system which enabled an Irish clergyman to die the other day, in full possession of nine livings, and which now elevates an English one to the mitre, whose sole recommendations are his apostacy and his having *seven* sons? Of course these seven sons must be provided for; it is nonsense to suppose otherwise: these are not the days of clerical disinterestedness and patriotism, and it is, therefore, but reasonable to expect that the See of Exeter, like that of Ely, will be henceforth the rich monopoly of one man. In Ireland the same grievances exist, though to a still more deplorable extent, for Mr. O'Connel, at a late dinner given to him at Cork, assured his hearers that "in a miserable parish near Mill street, he saw upwards of 30*l.* levied, and for what? to support a church for the immense number of 14 Protestants!" Is not this monstrous?

In every age the undue wealth of the Church has been a grievance, but never was that grievance so acutely felt as at present. With a declining revenue; with a weight of taxation that would break the back of Atlas; with commerce, agriculture, the arts, each and all in a state of depression, we are called on still further to augment our distresses by swelling the revenues of a Church already gorged with wealth, and yet clamoring for more. But the Church, it may be urged, deserves support? Undoubtedly; but only to the extent of its utility. If that utility, on an impartial and honorable investigation, should be found limited, so on every principle of justice should be the revenues of the Ecclesiastical Corporation. As for the old clamor which has *winded* so many of our Ultras Pitt dinners—of Church and State, it is a mere juggle got up to throw dust into the eyes of the people. Its real meaning is, that the Church binds itself to the State, so long, (and no longer) as the State guards its pluralities from invasion. In like manner the State, and dearly it pays for its alliance, binds itself to protect the Church, provided the Church will in turn lend it the sacred, "heaven descended" authority of its countenance. That this is the true and only meaning of the compact, the annals of James II. abundantly attest. During the early period of that dotard's reign, the Clergy, and particularly the Bishops, were the

loudest in defence of the divine right of Kings; but no sooner did the royal despot attempt to cripple their power by putting forward Popery, than the Church, with the Bishops, of course, at their head, alarmed not for the safety of their religion, but their pluralities (see DEFOE's works) took fright, recanted all they had said about divine right, and took the lead in turning out JAMES and bringing in WILLIAM, under whom they imagined their darling pluralities would be safe. This was the true secret of the patriotism of the Seven Bishops. At a less fortunate crisis they would have been shown in their proper colors; but the events of the day were in their favor, and in great political changes we must not look so much to character as to influence.

London Paper, October 18, 1830.

A NEW DISCOVERY,

Made by Samuel Williams of Pittsburg.

THEOLOGICAL schools, it is now discovered, are the only safeguards from error. For the want of them many Baptists and Methodists have become a prey to the ancient gospel. But the Presbyterians, through the abundance of learning and money which they control, are impregnably secured against conviction. Hence, Mr. Williams, finding that the writings of the Apostles are wholly inadequate to the exigencies of this time, and that the ancient Baptist measures of getting "an evangelical ministry" by waiting for the special call and mission is not to be relied on, recommends an abandonment of both, and a substitution of Presbyterian policy.

But he is not a Talleyrand, nor an Ahitophel, else he would have seen that a good salary per annum is the best antidote against heresy; for of the many defections in ancient and modern times, very, very few can be adduced of any man apostatizing from a good living. The Church of Rome is wiser than Samuel Williams, and she takes care to secure the priesthood against the contagion of Protestantism by many silver and golden arguments.

One Regular Baptist has gone over, body, soul, and spirit, to Presbyterianism. Mr. Williams recommends an adoption of their measures, to his Regular Baptist friends. The *Literary* Baptist Chronicle and the Regular Baptist Miscellany publish it with approbation. So much for the signs of the times. The ancient gospel will unite the sects in opposing it, and prove that there is no real difference between the mother and her daughters. But hear Mr. Williams speak for himself:—

"One evidence of their utility and propriety is, that the propagators of error are the most virulent opposers of Theological Seminaries, although many of them are indebted to the patrons of these institutions for their learning, yet, like Judas Iscariot, have betrayed the cause they have professed, and abused the benevolence that instructed their ignorance. And the reason of this is obvious; they dread competition with men of literature and enlightened criticism, before whose expositions their flimsy speculations, and airy phantoms must fly away like the shades of night before the rising Sun. Those branches of the Church that have been negligent in this matter, are now suffering for their sloth and covetousness. I mean particularly the Baptists and Methodists,

their churches are distracted and destroyed. Some of their more whimsical and superficial ministers are decoyed over to the ranks of the enemy. But the Presbyterians, who are foremost in the education of their ministers, have remained unmoved, defying the efforts of avowed enemies and pretended friends, while all their arrows have fallen powerless at their feet. If then, the safety of the churches, the success of our ministers, in opposing error and advancing the truth, and the salvation of souls are in *any* measure connected with the Seminary as a means of preparing men for the service of the cause, can any lover of the truth, especially any Baptist professor, withhold his hand from giving, or restrain his heart from praying for its prosperity?

Your son and fellow-servant in the gospel,

SAMUEL WILLIAMS.

BRO. SEDWICK."

I would inform this gentleman that some of the most learned Presbyterian ministers in Europe and America have protested against creeds and human phantoms; and not a few of them have renounced Presbyterianism in toto. If the Baptists will give each and every preacher of orthodoxy from five hundred to five thousand dollars per annum, we may insure them against defection for $5 per head per annum. An insurance office might, on this principle, be set on foot of much profit to the stockholders.

EDITOR.

MARRIAGE—*No. I.*

IN regard to the relations which at present subsist in society, there are those kinds which may be defined with all certainty—these are *natural*, *political*, and *religious* relations. The last class of relations is constituted of those which are formed between disciples and God; between them and Christ; the Holy Spirit, and, finally, among themselves, as members of the same *religious community*, church, or congregation.

The second class, viz. *political* relations, are those which subsist among us as a body politic, as rulers and ruled, master and servant, &c. &c.

The first class comprises those relations which have their origin in *nature*; such are life, or relations to material nature; the marriage relation; the relation of parent and child, &c. Let us distinguish then between things which are different, and estimate them according to their proper nature. For we suffer as much by confounding things which are distinct, as in making a difference where none exist. A tree, a lion, and a man are endued with life: but it would greatly impede our progress in natural science to confound organic with animal, or animal with rational existence.

In this enumeration religious relations are the most refined and exalted; but at the same time they are the most remote: for we are *sons* and *fellow-citizens* before we are christians. We are born to our fathers and to the state, before we are born again to God. We are first natural, then spiritual; first sinners, then saints; first from beneath, then from above.

Political relations are those over which we are allowed to exercise the greatest control; for though we cannot be the children whom

we please, yet we may be the subjects of whom we please. Though we are not allowed by God to worship under Confucius, the Pope, or Mahomet; yet we may enjoy the rights of citizenship either under the Sultan or Emperor, or in these United States. We may in this respect be a Frank, a Spaniard, a Briton, a Republican, a Democrat, or a Monarchist, and yet violate no religious obligation.

But the most immediate class of relations is the natural; this is antecedent both to the political and religious; this is first in society, first in the world. Adam was first formed, then Eve. Marriage must obtain before children could be procreated, and children must be born before states could be created. It is, therefore, added, he brought her to Adam, and Adam said "this is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh." "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."

Some may object that Adam was made spiritual; but this is absurd. The Apostle says he was earthy, natural, animal; and the Tree of Life was given for the support of the life of which he was possessed, i. e. animal and rational, not religious and spiritual life: so that he was married to her a rational animal; a man made of the dust of the ground, not a religious, spiritual man, begotten anew by the faith and reception of a divine revelation.

Thus the marriage of two rational human beings has for its authority and warrant God their Creator; as much as the religious man has for the authority of his baptism God his Redeemer; or the political man has for his good government "the powers that be" by the ordination of God. God is the God of nature, society, and religion. If, then, our natural relations of brother and sister, parent and child, husband and wife, are limited or modified in any degree, it must be for the sake either of our political or religious relations.

Our natural rights and relations are, indeed, the legitimate objects of political legislation. We have all an equal right and need to our own will to pursue happiness, to acquire property, to marry, to have children, &c. but for social purposes we suffer ourselves to be curtailed of a certain part of our natural rights and liberties, that the residue or what is left may be secured to us by law, and enjoyed without alarm.

Our *natural* right, therefore, to acquire property, to pursue happiness, to marry, to have children, &c. &c. are completely done away in the social state; and all these things are, properly speaking, *politically* enjoyed by every person who is a member of a community. In society we have no *natural rights;* no natural ordinances; they are all *political*, all *social:* so that marriage itself, and even the possessing of children, is in this way political, with every thing we speak, act, or reason. Hence, the American government which abhors all interference, and legislation, on subjects of religion, does, nevertheless, take cognizance of all these things, whether it be the pursuit of happiness, property, fame, marriage, procreation, speaking, &c. &c. which, indeed, shows that in their judgment such things are not naturally connected with religion.

Now, what does political law say of these matters? Why, in the case of children, *e. g.* that they shall be under the guardianship of their parents until a certain age fixed for them by law, and that after this period they shall be at their own disposal. If they marry before this age without the consent of their parents, the marriage is null and void; if after it, the marriage is legal. Again, the parties in this affair of marriage must be united in the manner prescribed, and by the person authorized, by law. Our law, also, forbids polygamy, concubinage, and adultery; all which things are judged the proper objects of political legislation, otherwise the rulers have usurped the place of God, and, instead of being ordained by him as his ministers, are rebels.

Now as political authority comes in and limits the wild and unchecked liberties of nature, and throws a girdle around her naked freedom; if political rights or liberties are at all checked and modified, it must be on account of religion, and by him who is the Author of religion. God alone can come into a nation or people and say, that so and so it shall be; hitherto shalt thou come and no further. Now, then, it is granted that God has determined to take out from the nations a people for his name; a people to serve him in all things according to his will which will is expressed to them, the christians in the New Testament.

Has God, then, delivered any law on the subject of choosing our country and government? Are we to select a hot or cold climate—a government that supports his religion, or one that puts it down—one that sanctions any religion, or one that treats all with equal indifference? Has he said that his worshippers in Christ Jesus shall fill any offices in that government, within a republic or monarchy; that he shall not be a tax-gatherer, a lawyer, or a soldier? Has he said that I shall be free or bond when the gospel finds me; a servant to a christian or an infidel? Has he said that I shall hold no real property and employ only christian servants; that I shall have christian children, and be married only to one who has become a disciple? Or does he say I shall marry an unbeliever? Am I to form covenants only with those of the household of faith, and make no bargain at all with unbelievers? All these are the ordinances of man, or, in other words, political institutions; and every member in society has the right, if he has the will, to do any of these things. Does God, then, change, alter, or modify these ordinances of the nations, these political institutions. Christianity says, and she says it with emphasis, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers:" the powers that be are ordained of God. Again, "Be subject to every ordinance of man." We may live where we please, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America; serve whom we please, hire whom we please, hold an office if we please, profess the trade which we please, hold servants if we please, marry whom we please.

Does christianity, then, say any thing else? does she speak out, and speak explicitly too, with whom we shall form these relations? with christians or unbelievers? Jews, Turks, or Idolaters, or with

the children of those families which are called holy; for the children of a believer are called holy?—No: on the subject of forming any relation which is properly political, christianity says not one word. It is not at this stage of the business that she opens her mouth and teaches: for this would be to throw society into political casts. She allows, as society allows, our understandings, affections, appetites, and necessities, to make their own choice; but when the relation is once formed, then, indeed, she speaks out, and speaks explicitly, to the rulers and to the ruled, the soldier and the slave, the master and the servant, parent and child, husband and wife. "Wives obey your husbands;" "husbands love your wives;" "servants be obedient to your own masters according to the flesh;" "master do the same thing to them," &c. "pray for all men, kings," &c. &c. "be obedient to the powers that be," &c. &c. "he is the minister of God to thee;" "he beareth not the sword in vain."

Thus society does not change nor alter, but only modify the things of nature: and thus religion does not change nor alter, but only modify the things of society, and bring them back to nature if they have departed in such a way as to disturb or destroy society; for nature, society, and religion, are all of God. The conclusion of this matter, then, is this, that there is no law for the formation of political relations;—that is, with whom we shall relate ourselves, either as officers, soldiers, governors, masters, servants, slaves, children, parents, husbands, wives.

PARTHENOS.

QUERIES.

THE question, *whether the Great King has enacted any law, constraining virgins*, i. e. *unmarried persons of either sex, to intermarry only with professors of the same faith*—is one which has already excited some interest in some churches and which cannot fail to excite much interest in all societies where it is examined. There are certain crises favorable or unfavorable for such investigations. The present is, perhaps, a favorable crisis, there being not more excitement than is necessary to arrest the attention of the disciples to its importance.

On the premises submitted by "Parthenos," and the argument deducible from his premises, we would solicit his attention to the following queries:—

Query 1. Is not marriage that institution which makes the parties one, and places them on such an equality as no other relation, natural or political, recognizes, and ought it not, therefore, to be distinguished from other political relations?

2. Is not marriage the origin of all natural relations in the human family; and does it not deserve from its vast importance to be noticed by the Great Lawgiver, and excepted out of the rank of the relations which only spring from it?

3. Does not Paul, in saying that he had a right to lead about a sister wife, imply that he had no right to lead about a wife that was not a sister?

4. Are not widows commanded by the Apostle to marry whom they please, only in the Lord; and why should widows any more than virgins be restricted in these matters?

Parthenos will please attend to these topics in his next essay.

EDITOR.

MR. WILLIAM WARDER.

MR. WILLIAM WARDER of Russelville, Kentucky, handed me a letter which, by some contingency, has been lost, which he wished me to insert in this work, remonstrating against a classification of himself with the proclaimers of the ancient gospel in our acceptation of that gospel. He was represented by a correspondent as having been a proclaimer of that gospel which Peter announced on Pentecost—which he says was a mistake, for he never did say to any man, "Repent and be immersed for the remission of your sins." If this notice does not prove satisfactory to Mr. Warder, we will insert any thing which he may please to forward, touching this matter, which will free him from an imputation so revolting to his feelings.

ED.

THE HOLY SPIRIT, *for which Silas M. Noel contends.*

THE pleaders for miraculous conversions, physical influences, and who have denounced us for opposing *their* "holy spirit," give many strong proofs of *the manner of spirit* for which they contend. The following is one of the *inspirations* of Silas' Holy Spirit: It is represented as an extemporaneous effusion, and is, consequently, one of the purest workings of his Holy Spirit. It is only necessary to inform the reader that Philip S. Fall, of Nashville, Tennessee, a gentleman, a scholar, and a christian of the first order of the age, addressed a letter to S. M. Noel, through the Christian Examiner, concerning the obliquities of his course, written, too, in all good spirit. On reading this letter, the prophetic or poetic spirit seized Silas, and he extemporaneously pronounced the following *holy ballad*, which the Baptist Chronicle puts in its most Literary and Poetic Corner as an exquisite original:

Communicated for the Baptist Chronicle.

An Extempore by brother S. after reading the last letters of P. S. Fall in the C. E.

Our little Phill, can ne'er be still,
From nestling and from hatching;
'Tis point look up, to Cam'mell'sville,
'Tis point no point, with little Phill,
And yet he will be scratching.
CHORUS——Twittle twattle, &c.

And all the regenerate said "Amen, and Amen!" ED.

CORRECTION.

IT always affords me pleasure to have removed from my mind, or to be able to remove from the minds of others, an unfavorable impression of the moral character of any man professing christianity, whether agreeing or disagreeing with me in his views of any part of the christian institution. It will be recollected that in my remarks upon the remarks of Abner W. Clopton, some things were stated implicating his moral character. My remarks, it appears, were just; but it is satisfactorily alleged that Mr Clopton was innocent, inas-

much as he wrote upon the information which he had received, and had reason to believe that the information was correct. It is therefore with pleasure we insert the following extract from a very responsible correspondent, as it places the character of Mr. Clopton in a more favorable light in that one instance:

"In your notice of brother Clopton's 'Alleged Facts,' (Millennial Harbinger, p. 431) concerning Sharon Church, in Prince Edward county, your informant has, *doubtless without intention*, done him injustice. The publication produced some difficulty in Sharon Church, & upon an investigation, the Church decided that the circumstances of the case did not justify the language used in the notice, but conveyed to the mind of the public an idea not exactly in accordance with the facts.* A member of the Church present, frankly acknowledged that Mr. Clopton had received from him a statement which fully authorised the publication, but that he was now convinced his statement was not warranted by the circumstances of the case. The Church, when in possession of every thing necessary to enable her to form a correct opinion, unanimously decided that, in her opinion, there did not exist with Mr. Clopton any intention to misrepresent. The error may therefore be traced to the loose indefinite manner in which his informant made the communication.

"I do not intend to be understood as saying any thing in this communication derogatory to the very excellent brother from whom you received information; I know him *well*, and delight to bear testimony to the fact that his character both as a man and a christian is second to that of no man. I know his means of information justified the impression which he received, and which dictated his communication to you

* So far your informant, whom I have lately seen, was a witness to the proceedings, which accounts for his impression.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE *MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

W Clark, Greenville, N. C. pd vol 2. J Stump, Port Gibson, Miss. pd vol 1 for L Mathews, J Loving, J L Rowland, S Rundell, and J Pate. E Harris, Martinsburgh, O. pd vol 2. Wm H Erwin, Baton Rouge, La. pd vol 1 for himself and W Noble. M P Willis, Fulton, Mo. pd vol 1 for G Ballenger, W Douglass, and A Miller. H T Chevis, Winchester, Ky. pd vol 2 to W Poston. A T Marrs, Tompkinsville, Ky. pd vol 1 for A Hayes, Col D Hardin, Maj P Emmett, W H Wooten, and Webb & Goodall. Jos Barker, Maysville, Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for J Robertson & D Bagby; also vol 1 for J Walton: D Hughes, Springfield, O. pd vol 1. U S Roberts, King creek, S. C. pd vol 2. Jos Gaston, Augusta, O. pd vol 1. J N Smith, Athens, Ala. pd vol 2 for J Favor, and vol 1 for Chas Desnevict. J B New, Vernon, Ia. pd vol 1 for T Jameson & C Holcome. J McFadden, Esq Middletown, Pa. pd vol 1 for Isaac Horn. S Lake, Skeanatles, N. Y. pd vol 2. F V Sutton, White Cimnies, Va. pd vol 1 for W Carder and I T Sutton. T Thompson, Columbia, Mo. pd vol 1 for W Jewell. W Williams, I Forbes, I Glosspell, I Hough, I Blake, E V Cann, H Meeker, and C Latterby, Cincinnati, O. pd vol 1 to I T Jones. I G Abrams, Portland, Ala. pd vols 1 & 2. Wm Carman, Baltimore, pd vol 1 for W McPherson, Rushville, Ia.; and $12 for six subscribers, vol 1. J B Radford, Hopkinsville, Ky. pd vol 1 for H B Bush, P Allensworth, and L I. Leavel.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 4. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, APRIL* 4, 1831. Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

THERE IS A CREATOR.

THE Sceptics, under the banner of the Free Enquirer, published in New York by Robert Dale Owen, son of my sceptical antagonist, are still employed in doubting to a considerable extent. They have not yet, it is true, doubted the propriety of doubting, or whether they do actually doubt; but still they incline to doubt, because their five senses don't inform them of any thing farther off than the milky-way. They doubt not but their senses are infallible guides; and yet they cannot prove that any one of them tells the truth.

A Mr. Bacheler has recently undertaken to reason with the *male* Editor of the Enquirer, and to show him that he doubts against all reason, as well as against all revelation. Admitting only one point, and the following essay is unanswerable; viz: that he that reads it, as well as he that wrote it, has heard that there is a God Almighty and Omniscient. We present it to our readers as worthy of their perusal, and with a conviction that the reasoning in it can never be fairly combatted by any man. We have read Mr. Owen's reply; but it only more deeply convinces us of the impotency of atheism and the strength of theism. ED. M. H.

TO ROBERT DALE OWEN.

LETTER III.

SIR:

An insincere sceptic is one who, unwilling to believe a doctrine, sets his wits to work to disprove it; and though the evidence in its favor may be clear, yet he closes his eyes against it, and, it may be, comes at length to waver and doubt in reality, though dishonestly and unfairly.

I do not ask that it be admitted to me, that we cannot *know* there is a God. We *can* know this; some *do* know it;—and that too by *experience*. And, "if *any* man will do his will, *he* shall know." The question, however, now under discussion, is, not whether we *know* there is a God, but whether there is reason to *believe* this. And he who does even believe it, is neither an Atheist nor a Sceptic: for an atheist *dis*believes, and a sceptic doubts it.

"Why is the Universe a proof to us of any thing more than its own existence?" For the same reason that a work of art is a proof of an artisan; which proof exists, not in the circumstance that we have seen similar things made, but in the *manifestation* of a *plan* in the *thing itself*, showing it to be the *production* of a *mind*. Had the Highlander opened the watch that he found, and seen that the inside was composed of silver and gold and steel, who will for a moment believe, that he would have considered it an animal?

It is by the outward manifestation of mind, that we know even man to be possessed of one. We know not whether a stranger is an idiot, or possessed of reason, till his words or actions manifest the same. But *mere* words and actions do not manifest *intelligence*. Words may be nonsense; actions may be void of purpose. It is therefore the *kind* of words and actions, by which we determine with regard to mind. If a man manufacture a chair, for example, the article which he manufactures being for a *purpose*, shows him to be possessed of intelligence and design. Though the mind itself, therefore, is *within* its possessor, and invisible, the *proof* of it to others is in his works. It is in works, then, that we are to look for *evidences*, of mind; and *those* works are evidences thereof which manifest *an object:* a watch, for instance, *to keep time;* a chair, *to serve as a seat*, &c. &c. Now, if works of this description, that is, *works of purpose*, are not infallible evidences of mind, we cannot *prove* that even man has a mind, or that there is any such faculty as mind in existence. But if such works *are* infallible evidences, then we have countless evidences of the existence of mind manifested in the Universe. The eye is *to see;* the ear, *to hear;* the soil, *to produce food;* the sun, *to warm and enlighten*, &c. &c. Nor is it reasonable to say, that these are merely effects without design. The infant, for example, comes into the world prepared beforehand with organs of sensation *exactly adapted* to the state of things into which it enters;—which organs could only have had relation to futurity at the time of their being prepared, inasmuch as there was no chance for their exercise before its birth. Its eyes are adapted to the light, its ears to sounds, its lungs to the air, its palate to taste, its nose to smell; its whole self to every thing about it. Now what can be more incredible, than that all this *pre*-adaptation, this curious and appropriate *preparation* in *so many respects*, should merely *happen* so to occur, without an intelligent cause—without a designer. Again: Behold the different parts of unintelligent nature combining *to produce beneficial effects*. The earth receives and nourishes seed in her bosom; the sun imparts thereto his genial heat; the clouds, their copious showers: and, by these united operations, a crop is produced *to sustain man and beast*. And yet is there no design, no mind, concerned in all these movements!

"If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?"

Most assuredly, it requires infinitely greater credulity to believe that no mind is concerned in the regulation of the Universe, than to believe the Bible, or even the Koran!

But if we are told that 'tis the *nature* of things to operate as they do, so 'tis the nature of machinery to operate as *it* does. But is it a sufficient solution of the *cause* of the operations of machinery, to say this much respecting it, and there leave it?

To say that it is the nature of a factory to make cloth, would be a singular way indeed of accounting for its operations; but no more so than to to say, that 'tis the nature of the factory of the universe, equally unintelligent, to produce food. It is demonstrable by the operations of nature, all tending to purposes, that intelligence exists somewhere;—as much so as in the case of the cotton factory. It is equally demonstrable, that it does not exist in nature itself, any more than in the factory, inasmuch as intelligence does not exist in mere matter. Whence it follows, unavoidably, that there must be a God.

To me, Sir, 'tis strange logic, to be told, that a chair proves a chair-maker, only because we know that he made it. I should suppose that in such a case, the chair-maker would prove the chair, not the chair the chair-maker. To say that one thing proves another, because that other proves itself, does far transcend my utmost comprehension.

"Could we trace back the universe to its origin, and *know* that origin to be God," we should cease to *believe* in relation to the subject; for knowledge excludes belief. Hence, those who believe nothing but what they know, believe nothing at all.

It *is* for a sceptic to give a reason for his scepticism. If he sees no evidence of a God; if he does not absolutely *admit* his existence; it devolves on him to dispose of the difficulties consequent on his *non*-belief. He should know that he has something more to do than to stand and doubt. If he will have his doubts, let him take their consequences: let him reconcile intelligent effects with unintelligent causes, whether he can decide the case of the headless inhabitants of the sun or not: for these two cases are by no means parallel.

With regard to analogy between the making of a chair and a universe, although there is none so far as relates to the *creation* of the particles of matter which compose the universe, yet there is the most perfect, between the *arranging* of those particles *for purposes*, and the arranging of the various parts of a chair for *its* purposes.

To investigate the causes of things, is natural, reasonable, and useful. It is the method by which the human mind advances in improvement and knowledge. It is by *reasoning*, that we arrive at *conclusions*. It is not *tracing* a thing to its origin, to *see* that thing *originated*. He has but a poor claim to the name of a *free enquirer*, who confines himself to matters of *knowledge*. We do not *enquire* concerning what we *know*. Hence, if we are not to reason and enquire concerning things unknown, we must cease to reason and enquire at all. We reason *from* things which we *do* know, to things which we do *not* know. When we *know* both cause and effect, no room is left for *enquiry* on such a subject. To look on things around us, and merely to say that they are as they are, is any thing rather than investigation, and reasoning, and enquiry. Suppose Newton on beholding the hea-

vens had exclaimed, "Well, 'tis a simple fact that there are stars;" and then had stopped at that; where would have been his present system of astronomy? Suppose Columbus had said:—"That there is one continent I *know;* but I *know nothing about* any other: therefore, I will *reason nothing about one:*" what, in such a case, would have become of his discovery? Why, Sir, the *only* subjects of enquiry are those which we do not understand; and, for the very reason that we do *not know* the cause of the phenomena of nature, we should *enquire* concerning it. We see effects; there *must* then be a cause. And it is certainly a fair subject of *investigation*, whether that cause is intelligent or unintelligent.

When I say that God made this, that, and the other, I mean more than that man did *not* make them: I mean that God *did* make them—and that he did make whatever in nature has a beginning, is as evident, as that a thing cannot make itself—as evident, as that nothing cannot make something. And here I would ask, what in the universe has not a beginning? Has not every man, every beast, every bird, every insect, every fish, every tree, every shrub, every plant, and in fine every thing whatever that contains either animal or vegetable life? All these things, then, must necessarily have a Maker: they cannot *come into* existence without a Maker. And as they do, in their construction and adaptation, exhibit the impress of intelligence, they show their Maker to be possessed of intelligence, and therefore prove a God,

But, says the sceptic, what evidence is there that the universe as a whole ever *had a beginning?*—that *matter itself* had a beginning? I reply: The *mode in which it exists*. There is the impress of mind on *all* matter—on the universe *as a whole*. Now, as mere matter is void of mind, it cannot of itself exhibit marks of mind; whence, the marks which it does exhibit must have been derived, they are of course not eternal. The existence of *matter*, then, in a state of *order*, proves it not to have been eternal. The appearances of the earth likewise show the same thing; so does the present state of improvement in society; so does the present number of its inhabitants; so does all history; so does every thing that relates to the subject.

In saying that a chair *must* have a maker, I refer to nothing but the self-evident fact, that unintelligent matter cannot exist in a state of order, and with a clear reference to purpose, without being *made* so to exist *by* a maker. Had *matter* power and intelligence to adapt *itself* to purposes, the case would be different. But this we know it has not. And were chairs actually to "drop from the clouds," I should even then suppose they had a maker, though not a human one. Yea, were "a chair to be formed of the roots of a tree," in that event should I suppose the same. I deny, however, that a *natural* chair *can* be formed thus. It would be *super*natural, were any such thing to be thus produced. I speak of a real chair, properly so called, with its mortices and its tenons adapted to one another, its wedges and nails to hold it together, &c. &c. for a bunch of roots, grow as they might, would not be a chair, in the proper sense of the term.

To say that we cannot rationally *conclude* that the universe has a Maker, because we do not *know* that it has, is to put an end to all reasoning. What we *know*, we no longer *reason* upon; hence, if we cannot reason upon what we do *not* know, we can reason upon nothing. When we see a man make a chair, we *know* he makes it; we have no *supposition*, no belief, on the subject. But when we see an Egyptian mummy, we believe it had an embalmer, not however because we have seen embalmers embalm mummies, (for this we have not seen,) but the mummy itself exhibits evidences of having been embalmed, *to be preserved*. Still, the "phenomenon" of embalming does no more exist for our cognizance, than does the "phenomenon" of creating the universe.

To make a designer the proof of design, is absurdity itself. How can we know a designer? By looking into his cranium, and seeing his thoughts? O no! Well, how then? Why, by observing his outward manifestations of mind. But how do these prove a designer? By being adapted to purposes; which is all the proof we have of design or designer in the universe, and which is as clear in natural as in artificial things. To require us, then, to know a designer, in order to the proving of a design, is to require us to *know* a matter which is *to be proved*, that we may prove the evidences by which we are to prove itself!

The argument, that if order &c. indicate design and a designer in the case of the universe, they indicate the same in the case of its Maker, goes to destroy all distinction between a designer and his work. It is, to confound mind and matter. It is, to make one thing another; to make a *designer* a *design*; to make absurdities; contradictions; nonsense. What are we to understand by God's being the masterpiece of masterpieces, and by that harmony &c. indicated by his mind? Mind is not an indication. It is invisible. God's mind does not indicate harmony, but harmony indicates his mind—even the harmony of the universe. There is nothing in the nature of mind to show it to be an effect; and were it not that we know, that man has a beginning, we could not prove *his* mind to be an effect.

Inasmuch as that things do exist, something must necessarily have been eternal; for, had there ever been a time when there was nothing, there would never have any thing come into existence, because something cannot be produced by nothing. On any system, therefore, *something* must have been eternal—something absolutely without beginning. Now, as the universe did not come by generation, it must have come by creation, or have been eternal. Unaccountable as it is, either the universe or a Creator is self-existent and eternal. This is demonstration, and furnishes something to which the mind can fasten. To say the least, there is no greater difficulty in admitting the eternity of God, than in admitting that of the universe. Nor does any difficulty in the case, be it what it may, disprove the fact, that something did eternally exist. It stands in all the strength of demonstration; of certainty. The only question therefore is, Is the universe eternal, or is there an eternal and an intelligent Being? And now I

seriously ask, Which conclusion is the more reasonable:—that an unintelligent universe should have eternally existed in an intelligent manner; or that there is an intelligent Power which brought it into an orderly existence, and so continues it? In other words, Is there an intelligent Cause for the universe and its operations; or is there no intelligence—no cause?

ORIGEN BACHELER.

LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

LETTER V.

SIR—

IF you have not read the achievements of Jack the Giant Killer, you have no doubt seen many a hero of similar fortunes, vauntingly exhibit his valorous exploits, and heard him tell his "fetes of broils and battles," in which his conquests and triumphs adorned every tale and finished every period. Such persons are not few in every department; but in the hour of trial they are often seen to faint at the sight of blood, and to give to others the post which heroes choose. You have also long since observed that the sons of Bacchus, in their frantic revels, though poor and pennyless, are apt to boast of their wealth, of their houses and lands, deeds and tenements; but when called to pay off their orgies, are found destitute of a shilling. By some licentious freak of my imagination these associations of ideas rushed upon me when I read your enumeration of the palpable contradictions which you had found in the narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, touching the resurrection of Jesus.

One, sir, would imagine, from the frequency, familiarity, and fluency of your allusions to "the contradictions" found in those sacred historians, and from the boldness which you assume and evince, at one time, in challenging; at another, in ridiculing their pretensions to honesty and veracity, that you had amply proved their testimony to be a collection of palpable fables, a bundle of contradictions; and that all the learned, the wise, and good men of ancient and modern christendom were a pack of knaves, or a set of brainless dolts.

If, sir, you could find only one real contradiction in the whole volume, we might allow you to presume that there were others. But it is as intolerable on our part to hear you boast of "plenty of contradictions," as it is weak on yours to appear to triumph in victories which you have not gained.

Your tongue is your own, and so is your pen, and you may call harmony, *discord;* consistency, *contradiction;* or honesty, *knavery.* You may call virtues, *vices,* and give new names to things, or you may attach meanings to words not only differing from, but in opposition to, general usage or their universal acceptation.

It would, perhaps, be useful to you and profitable to others, were we to attempt to define and establish the character of a contradiction, before we proceed to examine those you have imputed to the four Evangelists. By the term "contradiction," I mean not merely a verbal

difference, nor even a verbal opposition, but *an irreconcileable contrariety of statement.* I ought not to presume to inform you, sir, a judge of law, evidence, and fact; for doubtless it is well known to you, that it is, in most instances, a very difficult matter to establish a *positive contradiction.* A seeming, a probable, a possible contradiction is one thing, and a real contradiction another. The former convicts no person of falsehood, accidental or intended; the latter always does. But it must be clearly and unequivocally proved.

That there are seeming contradictions in every narrative which I have read, political, religious, or common, I think is probable. But in almost every instance these seeming contradictions are only proofs of my ignorance of some of the incidents, and not of the falsehood of the narrator. Often, very often, these seeming contradictions are in more perfect coincidence with the fact, than assertions free from such appearances could have been.

But a contradiction is neither more nor less than a contradiction. It is not a seeming, or a possible; but a positive, irreconcileable contrariety of statement which constitutes a contradiction. Of this there is not one instance in the New Testament. Remember, sir, I have said, NOT ONE INSTANCE.

But we may, on the subject of contradictions, go still farther, and affirm, that even a contradiction in terms is not always, nor necessarily, a contradiction in fact, unless the terms be all used in the same sense. Of this innumerable instances might be given. For example; a Jew affirms, that "Elihu was the brother of Samuel;" a Grecian affirms that "Elihu was not the brother of Samuel." This is a positive contradiction in terms; but yet it is not a contradiction in fact. Both writers speak of the same Elihu and of the same Samuel, and yet both declare the truth. The apparent and positive contradiction in terms is removed when it is ascertained that the term *brother* with a Jew frequently denotes a cousin, but never with a Greek. Now had the term *brother* been of the same acceptation in both propositions there would have been a contradiction in fact as well as in terms. It is an ambiguous word, not only because in the instances given it represents different natural relations; but because it also denotes natural, political, and religious relations. Even among us persons may be natural, and neither political nor religious brothers; they may be political, and neither natural nor religious brothers; and they may be religious, and neither political nor natural brothers. How many contradictions in terms, and not in fact, might be framed on the ambiguity of this very definitive term I need not enumerate for your conviction.

You can have many similar instances in the term *day.* The Babylonians reckoned a *day* from one sunrising to another; the Italians, from one sunsetting to another; other nations reckoned their *day* from noon to noon; we, from midnight to midnight; and the Jews, from evening to evening. Now suppose a Chaldean historian had asserted that Cyrus finished the destruction of Babylon in *one day;* and an Italian writer affirms that Cyrus did not finish the destruction of Babylon in *one day;* we would have a contradiction in terms, but

none in fact. In our own acceptation, the term *day* is ambiguous; for in our civil sense a *day* is twenty-four hours. It sometimes includes both the light and the darkness—the day and the night; at other times, it is used in contradistinction from the night. How many contradictions in terms concerning the incidents of a single day, without a single contradiction in fact, could be formed, the humblest capacity may apprehend. It is unnecessary to multiply specifications—any one can furnish them in abundance. To constitute a contradiction in fact, it appears to be incontrovertible that all the terms must be used in the same sense, and that the statements made must be irreconcileable upon every conceivable possibility. From all of which we argue, and we hope, sir, with your conviction of its force, *that if a contradiction in terms is often no contradiction in fact*, with how much caution ought we to speak of contradictions in fact, when our premises are only mere circumstantial differences of statement!

If only one person had written the memoirs of Jesus Christ and the introduction of christianity into the world, you, it seems, would have been a believer; for you are so fond of consistency, and so great a lover of truth, that nothing prevents your being a christian but the contradictions between the four historians. Now, if but one had written these transactions, you must have believed, as then there would have been none of your contradictions: for you have not dared because you are too honest, to censure any one of these historians for contradicting himself. If you apprehend the force of this, as I doubt not you do, then you must see it increases the difficulty tenfold on your part, to make them contradict one another. A thousand considerations explanatory of discrepancies between historians not writing in the same country, nor exactly contemporaneous, can be adduced to solve difficulties which could not be made to bear upon the testimony of the same individual, presented to the same persons. And, indeed, the same individual, in telling the same story four times over to four different audiences, though more frequently appearing to contradict himself, is not so easily convicted of a real contradiction as he would be in telling the story once to the same audience; for one reason, among many others, he may, for the sake of his audience, omit some things and enlarge upon others, which will cause more apparent discrepancies than could appear in addressing the same audience. In the ratio, then, of these reasons for varieties in narratives, is the difficulty of proving contradictions in fact, from any verbal differences or oppositions in statements made.

Thomas Paine and most of his admirers have licensed themselves to call omissions *contradictions*. Hence the numerous contradictions alleged against the four Evangelists, because some of them have omitted to record certain incidents which the sceptics think ought to have been recorded, and because they have not all recorded the same incidents in the same words. In the free and declamatory style of sceptical writers, every omission is called a contradiction. Of this I hope to convict you in the sequel. You have kept so much of their com-

pany that you have not only received their spirit, but caught their style.

But it is not only because some of the Evangelists have omitted to record what the others have mentioned, that they are so often arraigned before the merciless bar of sceptical criticism; but because Josephus, or some other writer, has omitted to state all that they have written, or more than they have recorded. The following instances and remarks from Chalmers are worthy, sir, of your attention; and, therefore, I will take the pains to lay them before you: —

"In the gospel, we are told that Herod, the Tetrarch of Galilee, married his brother Philip's wife. In Josephus, we have the same story; only he gives a different name to Philip, and calls him Herod; and what adds to the difficulty, there was a Philip of that family, whom we knew not to have been the first husband of Herodias. This is at first sight a little alarming. But, in the progress of our inquiries, we are given to understand from this same Josephus, that there were three Herods in the same family; and therefore, no improbability in there being two Philips. We also know from the histories of that period, that it was quite common for the same individual to have two names; and this is never more necessary, than when employed to distinguish brothers who have one name the same. The Herod who is called Philip, is just as likely a distinction, as the Simon who is called Peter, or the Saul who is called Paul. The name of the high-priest, at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, was Caiaphas, according to the Evangelists. According to Josephus, the name of the high-priest at that period was Joseph. This would have been precisely a difficulty of the same kind, had not Josephus happened to mention that this Joseph was also called Caiaphas. Would it have been dealing fairly with the Evangelists, we ask, to have made their credibility depend upon the accidental omission of another historian? Is it consistent with any acknowledged principle of sound criticism, to bring four writers so entirely under the tribunal of Josephus, each of whom stands as firmly supported by all the evidences which can give authority to a historian, and have greatly the advantage of him in this, that they can add the argument of their concurrence to the argument of each separate and independent testimony? It so happens, however, in the present instance, that even Jewish writers, in their narrative of the same circumstance, give the name of Philip to the first husband of Herodias. We by no means conceive, that any foreign testimony was necessary for the vindication of the Evangelists. Still, however, it must go far to dissipate every suspicion of artifice in the construction of their histories. It proved that, in the confidence with which they delivered themselves up to their own information, they neglected appearance, and felt themselves independent of it. This apparent difficulty, like many others of the same kind, lands us in a stronger confirmation of the honesty of the Evangelists; and it is delightful to perceive how truth receives a fuller accession to its splendor from the attempts which are made to disgrace and to darken it.

"On this branch of the argument the impartial inquirer must be

struck with the little indulgence which infidels, and even christians, have given to the evangelical writers. In other cases, when we compare the narratives of cotemporary historians, it is not expected that all the circumstances alluded to by one will be taken notice of by the rest; and it often happens that an event or a custom is admitted upon the faith of a single historian; and the silence of all other writers is not suffered to attach suspicion or discredit to his testimony. It is an allowed principle that a scrupulous resemblance between two histories is very far from necessary to their being held consistent with one another. And what is more, it sometimes happens that, with cotemporary historians, there may be an apparent contradiction, and the credit of both parties remain as entire and unsuspicious as before. Posterity is in these cases disposed to make the most liberal allowances. Instead of calling it a contradiction, they often call it a difficulty. They are sensible that, in many instances, a seeming variety of statements has, upon a more extensive knowledge of ancient history, admitted of a perfect reconciliation. Instead, then, of referring the difficulty in question to the inaccuracy or bad faith of any of the parties, they, with more justness and more modesty, refer it to their own ignorance, and to that obscurity which necessarily hangs over the history of every remote age. These principles are suffered to have great influence in every similar investigation, every ordinary principle is abandoned, and the suspicion annexed to the teachers of religion is carried to the dereliction of all that candor and liberality with which every other document of antiquity is judged of and appreciated. How does it happen that the authority of Josephus should be acquiesced in as a first principle, while every step in the narrative of the Evangelists must have foreign testimony to confirm and support it? How comes it that the silence of Josephus should be construed into an impeachment of the testimony of the Evangelists, while it is never admitted for a single moment that the silence of the Evangelists can impart the slightest blemish to the testimony of Josephus? How comes it that the supposition of two Philips in one family should throw a damp of scepticism over the gospel narrative, while the only circumstance which renders that supposition necessary is the single testimony of Josephus; in which very testimony it is necessarily implied that there are two Herods in that same family? How comes it that the Evangelists, with as much internal, and a vast deal more of external evidence in their favor, should be made to stand before Josephus, like so many prisoners at the bar of justice? In any other case, we are convinced, that this would be looked upon as *rough handling*. But we are not sorry for it. It has given more triumph and confidence to the argument. And it is no small addition to our faith that its first teachers have survived an examination which, in point of rigor and severity, we believe to be quite unexampled in the annals of criticism."

But, with a full reference to your notions of contradictions, and to give you an idea with how much ease they can be dissipated, I will give you the following specimen of a case *generically*, if not *specifi-*

cally in point; only with this difference, that the circumstance is a very trivial one; but so much the better, as it can be examined without any movement of the passions or feelings from interest, or any other temptation:—

Four persons, who, as they passed along, witnessed the salvation of a drowning man, reported in the village where they stopped as follows:—*A* said he "saw a man in the act of being drowned in the river; but he was saved by a man on the bank." *B* reported that he "saw a man sinking in the river; but he was saved by a plank." *C* stated that he "saw a person narrowly escape drowning, and that he would have been drowned in the river, but for a skiff which came to his relief." And *D* affirmed that he "saw a man in the act of drowning, but was saved by a lad who threw him a rope." Each of these witnesses told this matter in his own neighborhood of the town in which they lived. After a short time their reports spread through the whole town, and the contradictions became a matter of criticism. Hitherto they had sustained a good reputation for veracity; but *S*, a very captious gentleman in town, said it was all a fable, and he believed nothing of it. It was to no purpose that his neighbor *O* spoke of the general character of the witnesses, and that he alleged they could have no interest in fabricating such a thing. How can you believe such *contradictions?* he rejoined. Some of them falsifies, and which of them to believe, or whether any of them, I know not how you can decide. *A* says he was saved by a man on the bank of the river; *B*, that he was saved by a plank; *C*, that he was saved by a skiff; and *D* affirms that he was saved by a lad casting to him a rope. It is irreconcilable! Incredible! Who can believe such palpable contradictions? Perhaps, rejoins *O*, there is a possibility of reconciling all these seeming contradictions were we to hear all the circumstances.

In the mean time, *A* drawing near, they agreed to refer to him their difficulties. *A* observed that the reports of *B*, *C*, and *D*, were as correct as his own. But as he did not suppose it necessary to his being believed that he should narrate all the circumstances, he presumed neither did they. But, gentlemen, continues he, as you seem to take much interest in the matter, I will circumstantially narrate the whole of it:—

The person of whom we spoke had gone into the river to bathe, and after swimming some distance into the river, was returning to the shore; but having become faint and exhausted, he began to sink and called for help. At this crisis a person on the bank of the river ran to the shore, seized a small plank, and pushed it with all his might into the river. The exhausted stranger had just as much strength as to lay hold of it and raise his breast upon it, but the current was carrying him down the river with considerable velocity. After descending a few rods, a lad who was returning from the opposite shore, hastened out of his course to relieve him, and had nearly approached him before he was seen by the man on the plank, who, upon turning round to seize the skiff, lost the plank, and failed in reaching the skiff. In this crisis the lad threw him a rope which he succeeded in grasping, and by this means he was taken into the boat and brought safe to shore.

O exclaimed, I thought if the matter had been examined minutely all the difficulties might have been overcome. But *S*, abruptly turning round, departed without making a single remark.

Thus, sir, the four testimonies are all true; the alleged contradictions vanish upon a careful examination of all the circumstances. It will be easy for you to make the application to your "plenty of contradictions" in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, touching the resurrection of the Saviour of the world. This task I will, with all respect for your intellec assign you till you next hear from me.

Your obedient servant,

EDITOR.

GENTILE BAPTISM.

From the Christian Messenger.

BY an unhappy turn in the wheels of the car of Reformation, we find ourselves thrown back upon the ages that succeeded the Apostles; in which, from an erroneous interpretation of the figurative language of a few passages in scripture, in which the symbol was identified in word, with the thing signified, very similar to the mistake which afterwards led to transubstantiation. It was universally supposed that baptism was invariably accompanied with a supernatural effect, by an *immediate* divine agency, which totally changed the state and character of the candidate, and constituted him a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven. Hence it was almost constantly denoted by the terms *illumination*, *regeneration*, and others, expressive of the highest operations of the Spirit: and it was believed to obtain *the plenary remission of all past sins*; it was sometimes, in order to insure that benefit, purposely deferred to the latest period of life. This was the case with the Emperor Constantine, who, after having spent many years in adjusting the order, and orthodoxy of the christian religion, and determining matters of controversy, between bishops and councils, and ratified the Nicene Creed, submitted to baptism, as we are informed by Eusebius, for purifying himself from offences, and cleansing his soul from guilt, which he believed was to be effected by the power of mystic words and the saving love. When he was baptized, which was just before his death, he said to the bishops who surrounded him, "This is the period I have so long hoped and prayed for; the period of obtaining the salvation of God." Constantine was a Novatian. The Novatians formed a sect that sprung up in the third century, which, on account of their views of baptism in washing away sin, and their interpretation of Heb. vi. 4. 6. believed that no person who had been excluded from the fellowship of the church, ought ever to be restored, even upon repentance. A practice contrary to this sentiment caused them to separate from the church, and to form a new sect. They reasoned thus: Baptism is to be performed but once in a man's life, and it is the only act by which sin is remitted; therefore, all the sin that is committed after baptism, has no remission; and a church which re-admits persons, who by having sinned

after baptism had forfeited their membership, is a corrupt church. Constantine, to avoid the remediless fate of those who might sin after baptism, preferred to sin on until just before his death, to which period he designedly put off his baptism, when he was baptized and cleansed his soul from all sin, and received the salvation of God. The Roman Catholics have remedied this evil by instituting the *ordinance of confession*, which is *one of their seven sacraments*. They maintain that "all sins committed previous to baptism need not be confessed, for it is the doctrine of the church that they are all washed away by the administration of that rite;" and they "maintain that the remission of sins committed after baptism can be secured in no other way but by confession to a priest, when this can be done; when a priest cannot be obtained, then the *desire* to confess will be accepted of God." I shall be very sorry to see Bible Christians of the present day, or any portion of them, return to this system of things, or to any part of it. I greatly fear that this will be the case from the signs of the times. This old doctrine, in part, is brought to view as a new discovery, and is about to be made the occasion of a new sect. I feel greatly afflicted at this, and regard it as a real calamity. I do this, because I am fully convinced that the leading idea of the system is founded in mistake, and because the present sectarian system of things which is so derogatory to the honor and service of Jesus Christ, the happiness of his people, and the conversion of the world, will be strengthened and perpetuated by it. I say, this new principle, or this old one revived, that is about to be the basis of a new sect among the Baptists, is founded in error. The error arises from wrong views of the few places in the New Testament, in which the *promise* of the remission of sin is connected in *expression* with *baptism*. From this it is asserted that baptism is the only medium or action known in the word of God, by which he remits the sin of believers. With fully as much confidence as this sentiment is asserted, I assert the contrary. Here, then, is an issue made up fairly between what may be called *the Baptist Reformers* and myself. I desire to be fully understood upon this subject, and will state the principle which I defend with proper limitations and qualifications. I maintain that it is the doctrine of the New Testament, that God justifies the Gentiles by faith alone, and that baptism has no more to do in procuring the remission of sins, or is no more the action through or by which sin is actually remitted, than any other work of faith is; and I moreover assert, with a view of proving it beyond any reasonable doubt, by the word of God, that baptism is wholly misapprehended in its design and use as administered to the Gentiles, when viewed as the reformers view it. You perceive that I limit my observations on the subject of baptism, to the Gentiles. I do this to elicit investigation and to bring the subject to a narrow and definite compass. What I have now said will excite many inquiries. It will be asked, Why this difference between Jew and Gentile? Has God one way of saving the Jew, and another to save the Gentile? In my turn I would propose a few questions, too, for consideration. What was the difference between the Jewish state,

and the state of the Gentiles before the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ? What was the difference between the Jewish state before the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and afterwards, before they embraced the Christian religion? What was the difference between the Jewish state after the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and the Gentile state, before they embraced Christianity? Did John the Baptist preach the baptism of repentance to the Gentiles? And if not, why did he not? What was the difference between Jesus' disciples and christians? Were there any difference between the ministry and baptism of John, and the ministry and baptism of Jesus Christ and his disciples previous to the day of Pentecost? and if there was, what was it? How far were any of the discourses delivered by Christ during his ministry to the Jews, before his crucifixion, applicable to the Gentiles? Was the discourse delivered by Peter on the day of Pentecost applicable to the Gentiles, and if it was in any degree, to what extent? How far were the Jews being pricked to the heart on the day of Pentecost, and their inquiry, men and brethren what shall we do? limited to, and produced by their state, as distinguished from the state of the Gentiles? and how far was Peter's reply, Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you and to your children and them that are afar off, &c. owing to, and limited by the peculiar situation and state of the Jews, as distinguished from the Gentiles? The same inquiries may be made of Saul of Tarsus in reference to his baptism.

When these subjects are fully understood, all the difficulties that now seem to present themselves will disappear.

In the next number of the Messenger, I will adduce my proof before its readers, that the New Testament does not authorise the belief, that the sins of the Gentiles are remitted in baptism at all. In the mean time I hope your readers will examine the scriptures with honest and untiring care, by reading the Old and the New Testament, so as to be able to satisfy themselves truly and scripturally, in reference to the subjects on which I have propounded the above questions.

The *essential* qualifications of a real reformer consists, in my judgment, in supreme love to Jesus Christ and his truth, with a correct acquaintance with it, and the exclusion of all sectarian principles and feelings. Such a person with the truth of the gospel, cherishes the affections, motives and sympathies of the gospel. He will call every thing by the right name, and have every thing in its right place, and can quote every part of scripture which treats of doctrine, ordinances and duties, with equal pleasure; and while he fellowships all christians, to the extent they fellowship Christ and the Apostles, in their acts of worship, and in participating with them in the blessings of the gospel, he withholds his approbation from their errors, and all partyism. Without these qualifications, any reformation that may be attempted will amount to but little more in the end than the reformation of a sect, or a party. Presbyterians may reform so as to sing

Rouse's version of the old Psalms, or so as to form a Cumberland Presbyterian sect; and the Methodist may so reform as to get clear of the supremacy of their bishops, and divide the legislative, judicial and executive power of their sect into more numerous hands, and have a more divided representation in their conferences, and other ecclesiastical meetings; and the Baptists may reform so as to give to baptism the efficacy of remitting sin, or of making it the action by which sin is remitted. But after all this, they are sectarian still, and *may be* but little better, and *perhaps worse* for mending. I cannot give utterance to what I believe and know to be the direful consequences of sectarianism in its mildest forms, upon the interests of religion, and the peace and happiness of society.

ARCHIPPUS.

Always willing that our readers shall have the same opportunity of judging for themselves that we have, I am solicitous that they may hear both sides of every important question, and know all that can be said against, as well as for every proposition which we offer. This is what we ask from our opponents: and although they will not yield to our importunities, still we feel ourselves compelled by the controlling principles of our religion, not to imitate them, but to give a fair exhibit of both sides.

The essay above quoted from the Christian Messenger deserves special attention, because it contemplates a new ground of opposition to the Apostolic Gospel, as we consider it. The writer of it seems to be a half reformer or middle-ground man, who divides baptism into two species; one for the Jews, for remission of sins—and one for the Gentiles, after they are pardoned. He has taken a middle ground. To the Jew he would preach baptism for remission; to the Gentiles, baptism without remission. From the versatility of his genius in other matters, we shall not be surprised to find him abandon his Jewish baptism, that he may secure his Gentile baptism.

But it will be time enough to examine the grounds and reasons of this opinion when he has presented them to the public. In the mean time, we shall offer to him and the public a few remarks on the essay before us:

The author of this essay is supposed to be a reformer, but a reformer of a peculiar class; and if public fame be worthy of credit, the "car of his reformation" moves in a circle, or, after starting from the city of Presbyterianism, and after much hard toiling for some years, it has stopped in the suburbs of the old city again. He has the same doctrine of communion which this essay exhibits on baptism. He admits that among the old converts there was no breaking of the loaf, save among the immersed disciples; that sprinkling infants is a human tradition; yet he teaches that among the Gentile christians of the present day, all christian union, even to the breaking of the loaf, ought to be practised irrespective of the views of the participants in favor of infant sprinkling, or christian immersion. It is not to be wondered at, then, that he should divide the institution of baptism, as he

has that of the Supper, and give it one meaning to a Jew, and another to a Gentile. I doubt not but this peculiarity arises from a warm desire to promote brotherly kindness and love. We only state these premises to enable the reader to appreciate the conclusions to which he has come.

But we have some complaints to offer which we think are worthy of the attention of Archippus, and these we will arrange in numerical order:

1. Why should he assert that our views of immersion throw us back upon the ages which succeeded the Apostles? He would insinuate not to the age immediately succeeding, or the age of the Apostles itself, but to the third or fourth age after the Apostles. This is "*ad captandum vulgus*," to catch the thoughtless by representing that we had not gone back to the Apostolic Age, but only to some dark age subsequent to that age. But where is the proof? This he has as yet kept to himself!! Will this saying prove any thing? Nothing for him, and nothing against us. It is only to prejudice, or to inveigle the undiscriminating. Why tell us of the conversion of Constantine, and his notions of baptism? What will this prove? But he wished to introduce the Novatians, and he tells us that Constantine was a Novatian. This we complain of as an unlawful, wanton, and pointless attempt to prejudice, rather than to convince.

2. Why introduce the name of Novatius, or the Novatians, and represent the idea of baptism for the remission of sins as originating with them? or at least, as the first public advocates of this view? This is not a fact. We challenge him for the proof.

3. Or does he intend to side with the Catholics and call the Novatians heretics, and thus ally us with heretics? This is unmanly, unjust, and every way illogical. We complain of these things, as unworthy of a high-minded man, and of a fair controversialist. But in the next place,

4. We complain of his alleging *false facts* in his allusions to history. The following sentences he cannot sustain from any authentic document on earth. "The Novatians formed a sect that sprung up in the third century, which, on *account of their views of baptism* [not a fact] in washing away sin, and their interpretation of Heb. vi. 4–6. believed that no person who had been excluded from the fellowship of the church ought ever to be restored, even upon repentance. A practice contrary to this sentiment caused them to separate from the church, [what church? Ask Mr. Jones] and to form a new sect." This is in a great measure imagined by our friend. He cannot adduce any document to sustain him. I have no doubt but he thought that his imaginations on this subject were all true history. I was confounded when I read these sentences, and immediately brushed the dust off Eusebius, from whom all the moderns borrow. But behold, Eusebius says no such thing. The Catholics call the *Novatians* heretics, and our friend catches their spirit. But Eusebius never once mentions any peculiarity in their views of baptism. He only says, (London Edition Folio A. D. 1709, page 120) that Novatius "disalloweth of Ho-

ly Baptism," without a single specification. In a note it is explained, that he contemned the baptism of the Catholic Church as inefficient. Yea, the very reverse of Archippus' saying, is the fact, as stated by Valesius. In his note upon the passage, he says: "The confession of faith made by the catechumens before baptism, when they said 'they believed the remission of sins,' he abolished; for, says Valesius, Novatian did not allow remission of sins." I have examined every allusion to Novatian in Eusebius, and find no countenance for the assertions of Archippus.

Mosheim, vol. 1 p. 299 of his history, exonerates the Novatians from the charge of Archippus. He says, "Novatian, a presbyter of the Church in Rome, was a man of uncommon learning and eloquence;" of an "austere and rigid character." The sect of the Novatians, (he avers) cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Christianity by their opinions. Their crime was the unreasonable severity of their discipline—by which they made an unhappy rent in the Church.

Again, page 300, Mosheim says, "There was no difference in point of doctrine between the Novatians and other Christians. What distinguished them was, their refusing to re-admit to the communion of the church those who after baptism had fallen into the commission of *heinous crimes*, [such as idolatry or apostacy, not every offence,] though they did not pretend that even such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation." Mosheim assigns them no peculiar views of the meaning of baptism. "They only," says he, "considered the baptism administered in those churches [which were lax in discipline] which received the lapsed to their communion even after the most sincere and undoubted repentance, as absolutely divested of the power of imparting the remission of sins," which was the doctrine of the whole church at this time: for "*in doctrine* the Novatians differed not from other Christians." Mosheim refers to Eusebius; but Eusebius does not justify all his remarks. I have read the references. They rebaptized all whom they received from the Catholic Church, not because they had a new or different baptism, but because they considered that church immoral and impure.

Jones, whom I think Archippus regards as one of the best historians, condemns all his allusions to the Novatians. So also does the historian Robinson. These worthy Baptists speak in the highest terms of the Novatians. All Jones alleges against the Novatians, and this he does with considerable doubt, is, that *it is said* Novatian refused to receive into the communion of the church any, who in time of persecution, had been induced through fear of sufferings or death, to apostatize from their profession, and offer sacrifices to the heathen deities, a principle which he founded upon a mistaken view of Heb. vi. 4. 6. The following is one of the fairest accounts of the true character of the Novatians which we can find on the pages of any historian:—

THE NOVATIANS.

"The following is the account given of Novatian by the late Mr. Robert Robinson, in his Ecclesiastical Researches, p. 126; and I the more readily

submit it to the reader, because none who knew Mr. Robinson, can, for a moment, suspect him of having any undue predilection for the principles of Novatian. "He was," says he, "an elder in the Church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrine as the church did, and published several treatises in defence of what he believed. His address was eloquent and insinuating, and his morals irreproachable. He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church. Christians within the space of a very few years were caressed by one emperor, and persecutrd by another. In seasons of prosperity many persons rushed into the church for base purposes. In times of adversity they denied the faith and reverted again to idolatry. When the squall was over, away they came again to the church, with all their vices, to deprave others by their examples. The bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this; and transferred the attention of christians from the old confederacy for virtue, to vain shows at Easter, and other Jewish ceremonies, adulterated too with paganism. On the death of bishop Fabian, Cornelius, a brother elder, and a violent partisan for taking in the multitude, was put in nomination. Novatian opposed him; but as Cornelius carried his election, and he saw no prospect of reformation, but, on the contrary, a tide of immorality pouring into the church, he withdrew and a great many with him. Cornelius, irritated by Cyprian, who was just in the same condition, through the remonstrance of virtuous men at Carthage, and who was exasperated beyond measure with one of his own elders, named Novatus, who had quitted Carthage, and gone to Rome to espouse the cause of Novatian, called a council and got a sentence of excommunication passed against Novatian. In the end Novatian formed a church, and was elected bishop. Great numbers followed his example, and all over the empire *Puritan* churches were constituted and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, *and a succession of them continued till the Reformation.*"

"The same author, afterwards adverting to the vile calumnies with which the Catholic writers have in all ages delighted to asperse the character of Novatian, thus proceeds to vindicate him:—

"They say Novatian was the first Antipope; and yet there was at that time no pope, in the modern sense of the word. They call Novatian the author of the heresy of puritanism; and yet they know that Tertullian had quitted the church near fifty years before, for the same reason, and Privatus, who was an old man in the time of Novatian, had, with several more, repeatedly remonstrated against the alterations taking place; and, as they could get no redress, had dissented and formed separate congregations. They tax Novatian with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the empire; and yet he had no other influence over any, than what his good example gave him. People every where saw the same cause of complaint, and groaned for relief; and when one man made a stand for virtue, the crisis had arrived; people saw the propriety of the cure, and applied the same means to their own relief. They blame this man, and all these churches for the severity of their discipline; yet this severe discipline was the only coercion of the primitive churches, and it was the exercise of this that rendered civil coercion unnecessary. Some exclaimed, it is a barbarous discipline to refuse to readmit people into christian communion, because they have lapsed into idolatry or vice. Others, finding the inconvenience of such a lax discipline, required a repentance of five, ten, or fifteen years; but the Novatians said, You may be admitted among us by baptism; or, if any Catholic has baptized you before, by rebaptism; but if you fall into idolatry, we shall separate you from our communion, and on no account readmit you. God forbid we should injure either your person, your property, or your character, or even judge of the truth of your repentance or your future state; but you can never be readmitted to our community, without our giving up the last and only coercive guardian we have of the purity of our [fellowship.] Whether these persons reasoned justly or not, as virtue was their object, they

challenge respect, and he must be a weak man indeed, who is frighted out of it, because Cyprian is pleased to say they are the children of the devil."

"The doctrinal sentiments of the Novatians appear to have been very scriptural, and the discipline of their churches rigid in the extreme. They were the first class of Christians who obtained the name of (*Cathari*) Puritans, an appellation which doth not appear to have been chosen by themselves, but applied to them by their adversaries; from which we may reasonably conclude that their manners were simple and irreproachable."——[*Jones' History.*]

Upon the whole, the Novatians are defended by Lardner and by Jones, Robinson, and some others, as the purest branch of the Church, as it is called; and notwithstanding their requiring apostates to be re-baptized, they stand with the fairest character of any sect on the page of history down to the times of the Waldenses, or even to the time of the Reformation, though merged in other names. They are the parents of the Baptist sect, so far as it has any parentage out of the Church of Rome.

—

The vindication of the Novatians is no concern of mine; for it avails nothing with me whether they taught the Jews baptism, or the Gentiles baptism, according to my worthy friend Archippus. But we must do justice to the dead as well as to the living, and *nothing can be more unwarranted, from all history, than to say that "they were excluded from the Church of Rome because of their views of baptism in washing away sin."* I now call upon Archippus to retract this charge, or to make an effort to sustain it. And here I will take occasion to say, that he cannot find any man of any note, or any sect mentioned in history from Peter's Sermon on Pentecost till Constantine the Great, who held his views of baptism; nor any man who taught that baptism was not connected with the remission of sins. Both *his orthodox Church* which excluded Novatian, and *his* heretic Novatian, agreed in their views of "baptism, as washing away sin." Let Archippus name the man in all antiquity who opposed baptism for the remission of sins. We only use this as an *argumentum ad hominem.* When an opponent would represent us as reviving old heresies, or as holding the views of heretics, we wish him to remember that the orthodox, *his own* orthodox and the heretics were one in this matter. In this style does the present orthodox Roman Church represent all the Protestants, as reviving old heresies.

Upon the whole, we are glad to see Archippus make his issue on this question, seeing he is determined to be opposed; much more so, however, to have seen him act a more consistent part both towards me, himself, his friends, and the community. He has thrown down the gauntlet on a mere phantom of his own creation, and joined issue with the very persons, whom, of all others, he is the most bound from his own principles, concessions and professions to have sustained. We know his love for his own offspring. No father ever loved an only child with more enthusiasm, than this good doctor loves his own creations. We know it will require him some months to get down to the temperature of calm reason and dispassionate inquiry; and therefore we expect a vigorous effort on his part to maintain his Gentile Bap-

tism. But, reader, be assured he will have to surrender either his Jews baptism or his Gentile baptism before many moons, in the estimation of all men of sense and intelligence; and among these I would include himself. He has a good library, and has access to all the libraries in Lexington, Kentucky. And as he has fairly made an issue, we expect him to put forth all his powers in his own defence.

I have been at some pains to convict him of the loose and declamatory manner in which he alludes to facts and documents. Facts are stubborn things, not so pliable as speculations and opinions. We will show that his scripture allusions are as fanciful as his allusions to ecclesiastical history. His distinction between the import of baptism when a Jew and a Gentile is the subject, I would inform him is not new to me: for that thought occurred to me years ago, and was thoroughly canvassed. It amounts to little more than this, and all his preliminary questions amount to no more than this;—*A* was a drunkard; *B*, a thief; *C*, a liar; *D*, a Samaritan; *E*, an Ethiopian; *F*, a Frank; *G*, a Briton; *I*, an Italian; and *H*, a Hellenist: they were all converted to Jesus Christ. Now did baptism signify the same thing to *A*, *B*, *C*. &c. and was there no difference between these persons, national or characteristic, which caused baptism to mean one thing to one, and another thing to another? But I enter not into the merits of his views until he have farther committed them to writing. In this I only complain of his unfairness.

EDITOR.

A PROOF

Of the Inefficiency of the Popular Preaching and the Popular Systems.

THE Editor of the Religious Herald says that in the city of Richmond, Va. with a population of 17,000 souls, he does not believe it is known that 20 souls have become decidedly pious during the last twelve months. This is alarming indeed; for in the city of Richmond there are two religious journals, a Bible Society furnishing the whole state with Bibles, Missionary Societies, Tract, Temperance, Colonizing, Sabbath, and Dorcas Societies. Now, allowing one death to a hundred inhabitants, one hundred and seventy persons must have died during the time that not twenty persons became decidedly pious. In the country it was not much, if any thing, better, except where the ancient gospel is proclaimed.

In three months, a correspondent informs me, brother Dr. Duval immersed one hundred persons for the remission of their sins—all moving on piously so far as we are capable of judging. Yet the clergy are making war upon him!!

In New York, it is said, where a few years ago there were but a few known sceptics, Miss Frances Wright has obtained 20,000 followers, notwithstanding all the religious bustle of all the benevolent schemes of the day, with all the preachers of a hundred *isms* to aid them. Yet there is no need of reformation!!

EDITOR.

THE MILLENNIUM.

THE thinking part of the christian community are much more than at any former period, inquiring into the meaning of the prophecies. The Millennium, and the mode of its introduction, are the prominent topics of examination in all the recent publications in this department of sacred literature. Intellects of every order are furnishing their gleanings and their reasonings on these subjects in a greater ratio than the accumulation of satisfactory light and evidence on the questions which they discuss. This is to be expected as one of the signs or omens of the approximation of that much-wished-for period. Many are running to and fro in their inquiries, and therefore knowledge shall be increased.

I have just risen from the perusal of an octavo pamphlet, of 82 pages, from a Nashville press, and from the pen of S. M. M'Corckle, full of "*Thoughts on the Millennium*," and "*A Comment on the Revelations*;" also, "*A few Remarks on Church Government.*" A. D. 1730. The author relies more on common sense than on profound or extensive research, for the views which he entertains and exhibits on these subjects. Many of his thoughts are very good, and his motives appear to have been, what he affirms they were—good, in addressing the public in this pamphlet. This work is interspersed with many excellent remarks upon the present order of religious society, and sounds a necessary alarm to those sleeping christians who are said to be at ease in their own Zion.

The prominent views exhibited in this pamphlet we shall lay before our readers with all brevity:—

The date of the rise of the Man of Sin, whom he also calls Antichrist, he fixes in the year of our Lord 587. He arrives at this period by the same process of reasoning exhibited in our Debate with Owen, vol. 2, page 73. Making the cleansing of the sanctuary 2300 days, or years, from the going forth of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem, and subtracting therefrom the 490 years determined or counted on the Jews, he makes the birth of the Messiah 453 years from the rebuilding of the city and temple; thus leaving 1847 years since the birth of the Messiah for the fulfilment of the 2300 years. This calculation makes the year 1847 the time of the commencement of the Millennium; and then deducting therefrom 1260 years for the life of the Man of Sin, ascertains the year 587 as the time of his birth. About this time, John, Bishop of Constantinople, and Pelagius, Bishop of Rome, set up their pretensions for Universal Bishop. The Emperor deciding in favor of Pelagius, the Roman aspirant, gives him the supremacy, and thus he becomes, with his successors, in full character, his Man of Sin.

Gregory, who succeeded Pelagius, claimed the title of Judge and Vicegerent of the Most High, instituted the canon of the mass, prayers to saints as mediators, the festival of the Virgin Mary, and of the conception, the sale of relics, &c. &c. He came into the chair 590.

This writer makes a year in prophecy not the *lunar*, but the *solar*; and supposes it always to denote one revolution of the earth. Accord

ing to this data, he assigns to the year 1847 the tremendous judgments accompanying the slaughter of the Man of Sin.

Daniel's "little horn" he interprets as papal Rome, which rose to universal dominion upon the ruins of pagan Rome. The downfal of the Man of Sin, Christ's second coming, the judgment of Antichrist, and the commencement of the Millennium, with him are contemporaneous events. For the "little horn" was to make war upon the saints until the Ancient of days should come and the judgment should sit upon the nations; and this is to happen before "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, should be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."

After this cleansing of the sanctuary, a new order of priesthood is to be commissioned, a New Jerusalem to be set up, and new displays of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to men.

The present churches he calls harlots; the present priesthood, blind leaders of the blind, self-ordained, or ordained by antichristian hands. He then contrasts the typical priesthood, their vices, enormities, and downfal with the present; and only makes the fates of the modern priesthood more tremendous than those of the ancient. His new priesthood, called the "new heaven," of which Isaiah, Peter, and John spake, is to be commissioned by the Lord in person, "with sevenfold power and demonstration to the commission received on Pentecost." The churches are *all* in Babylon; but they are not churches, but "priest flocks," impiously called *the fold of Christ*. His words are, "Many of us, as *individuals*, are united to Christ; but, *collectively*, are the body of *harlots*, or that which is worse, of the great Mother of Harlots."

The "second beast" is the reformation from Popery. The reformed churches have got the power of the 'first beast." These churches, with many of their members, are to be engulphed in an intervening vortex preceding the Millennium, and these heavens are to be folded up as a scroll. Between this time and the Millennium is to be a time of trouble, "such as never was since there was a nation."

All this is prefatory to his comment on the Revelations. The Revelation of John after the three first chapters, is a history of the church, exhibited under the seven seals, as seven distinct periods:—1st. The *white horse* represents the introduction of christianity. 2d. The *red horse*, pagan persecutions. 3d. The *black horse*, christianity established with tests, creeds, and civil power. 4th. Corruptions consequent upon the establishment, are represented by the *pale horse*. 5th. Papal persecutions. 6th. The judgments preceding the Millennium. 7th. A New Jerusalem is set up.

The Messiah is to reign three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. The trumpets represent not things succeeding the seven seals, but constitute a kind of review under a new imagery. "Specialties, rather than general views, distinguish the scenery of the trumpets."

The *two witnesses* are the Word and the Spirit. "Physical and moral operations bearing witness in the field of providence and in the field of grace."

The "everlasting gospel" is a new dispensation, which shall last till the end of time, to be introduced at the commencement of the Millennium, having the same meaning with the "new heaven and the new earth." The present gospel, or institution, is to be rolled up like a scroll; for "the present church can never renovate herself."

The *vials* are all in the future. "I am decidedly of opinion," says he, "the vials are all in the future." The "false Prophet" means the clergy, or false teachers of the Catholic and Protestant church. The binding and loosing of Satan, Gog and Magog, and sundry other matters of curious import, this writer presumes not to explain. Indeed, he very candidly acknowledges, in many places, his inability to understand, and only exhibits confidence when he feels it.

He appears, upon the whole, to rely too much upon common sense and Scott's Family Bible. These two are not competent to unfold the secrets of the prophecies. The parts accomplished are more easily understood than the parts which are yet future. Even these require more research into the past than he has been well able to bestow upon the future. And, indeed, it is not to be expected that any one who has to confess ignorance of a large portion of the Apocalypse, can feel confident in his views of any part of it. Still every effort to increase our knowledge in this part of sacred literature ought to be thankfully received. Great diffidence in our own conclusions is allowable and becoming on the subject of prophecy. The intimate and extensive acquaintance with history, requisite to a developement of the predictions of Daniel and John, few men have either the leisure or the means to acquire. Some of the views presented in this treatise are very plausible, but others of them are as visionary as those of Burnet or Mede. Indeed, they are only improbable guesses, without any fixed data to sustain them. But yet the pamphlet is well worthy of a perusal, not only on account of the many truths uttered on the present state of things, but because it awakens attention to one very plain and interesting subject of prophecy, viz. that christendom is to be the theatre of the most tremendous calamities and sudden disasters, terminating in that unexampled earthquake, which is to destroy the monarchies, hierarchies, and all the bastard progeny of the Mother of Harlots, which, like the frogs of Egypt, pollute every synagogue, fireside, and closet in the land; and all this as preliminary to the commencement of the reign of a thousand years.

The reformation of churches and nations, *as such*, as well as the conversion of the heathen by the children of devoted Rome, is as chimerical as the ancient *crusades*. One impression, which we have long entertained, is deepened by the perusal of these pages, that, in proportion as the prophecies are understood, will the zeal and sectarian enterprize to proselyte the heathen abate. Until christendom is converted to Jesus Christ, nothing can be done to convert the world. But whether christendom can be converted to Jesus Christ, unless it be by the outpouring of all the vials of wrath due to the desolating abomination; unless it be by the sudden and tremendous display of the indignation of a twice crucified Lord, upon the incorrigible and

impenitent pretender to his doctrine and spirit, is a question of serious discussion. That a remnant will escape we cannot doubt; but as our knowledge of the future enlarges, so does the appalling amount of professors, who seem destined to be engulphed in the tremendous vortex of varied snd accumulated vengeance fast coming upon an apostate church.

We constitutionally incline to look at the bright side of the picture, and to take the most cheering view of things; but in defiance of this our bias, a deepening gloom overspreads our ecclesiastical heavens. The distant corruscations and the portentous stillness in the old world for a few years past, omen a gathering tempest, which, when it bursts—who can tell what unshaken and unscathed shall remain? And who shall stand when the Lord doth this—when he arises to shake terribly the earth!! He shall bathe his sword in the heavens, and the earth shall be soaked with blood!

A reformation, we rejoice to know, has always been proclaimed before the cup of indignation has been poured out. And, bless the Lord! this voice is heard in our land. Therefore, "come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues:" for unless you reform you shall also perish.

In our next number we propose giving an analysis of another new work on the prophecies. EDITOR.

REMARKABLE ANALOGY

Between the arguments for and against reformation in Luther's time and the present time, exemplified by a quotation from Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 3, p. 106, 110:—

"BUT, continues he, my present business is with the first reformers, and to them I return. Those who more especially merit that title, were Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Martyr, Bullinger, Beza, Oecolompadius, and others. Now these were all men of learning, who came forth into the field of controversy, in which the fate of future ages, with respect to liberty, was to be decided, with a kind of arms that did not at all give them the aspect of persons agitated by the impulse, or seduced by the delusions of fanaticism. They pretended not to be called to the work they undertook by visions, or internal illuminations and impulses; they never attempted to work miracles, nor plead a divine commission; they taught no new religion, nor laid claim to any extraordinary vocation; they respected government, practised and taught submission to civil rulers, and desired only the liberty of that conscience which God has made free, and which ceases to be conscience if it be not free. They maintained that the faith of christians was to be determined by the word of God *alone;* they had recourse to reason and argument, to the rules of sound criticism, and to the authority and light of history. They translated the Scriptures into the popular languages of different countries, and appealed to them as the only test of religious truth. They exhorted christians to judge for themselves, to search, to break asunder the bands of ignorant oppression and lawless authority, and to assert that

liberty of conscience to which they had an unalienable right as reasonable beings." These were the arguments of the reformers. The arguments of the opposers of reformation are the following:—

As soon as the Popes perceived the remarkable detriment their authority had suffered from the accurate interpretations of the Holy Scriptures that had been given by the learned, and the perusal of these Divine Oracles, which was now grown more common among the people, they left no method unemployed that might discourage the culture of this most important branch of sacred erudition. While the tide of resentment ran high, they forgot themselves in the most unaccountable manner. They permitted their champions to indulge themselves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the sacred writings, and by an excess almost incredible, if the passions of men did not render them capable of the greatest enormities, to declare publicly, that the edicts of pontiffs, and the records of oral traditions, were superior in point of authority to the express language of the Holy Scriptures. But as it was impossible to bring the sacred writings wholly into disrepute, they took the most effectual methods in their power to render them obscure and useless. For this purpose the ancient Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the Vulgate, though it abounds with innumerable gross errors, and in a great number of places exhibits the most shocking barbarity of style, and the most impenetrable obscurity with respect to the sense of the inspired writers, was declared, by solemn decree of the Council of Yunt, an authentic, *i. e.* a faithful, accurate, and perfect translation, and was consequently recommended as a production beyond the reach of criticism or censure.

It was easy to foresee that such a declaration was every way adapted to keep the people in ignorance and to veil from their understandings the true meaning of the sacred writings. In the same Council steps were taken to execute, with success, the designs of Rome. A severe and intolerable law was enacted, with respect to all interpreters and expounders of the Scriptures, by which they were forbidden to explain the sense of these divine books, in matters relating to faith and practice, in such a manner as to make them speak a different language from that of the church and the ancient Doctors. The same law further declared that the church alone, *i. e.* its rulers, the Roman pontiffs, had the right of determining the true meaning and signification of Scripture. To fill up the measure of tyrannical and iniquitous proceedings, the church of Rome persisted obstinately in affirming, though not always with the same impudence and plainness of speech, that the Holy Scriptures were not composed for the use of the multitude, but only for that of their spiritual teachers; and, of consequence, ordered these divine records to be taken from the people in all places where it was allowed to execute its imperious command." vol. 3, p. 158–9.

These circumstances had a visible influence upon the spirit and productions of the commentators and expositors of Scripture, which the example of Luther and his followers had rendered through emula-

tion extremely numerous. The Popish Doctors, who vied with the Protestants in this branch of sacred erudition, were insipid, timorous, servilely attached to the glory and interests of the court of Rome, and discovered, in their explications, all the marks of slavish dependence and constraint. They seem to have been in constant terror lest any expression should escape from their pen that savored of opinions differing from what were commonly received; they appeal every moment to the declarations and authority of the holy fathers, as they usually style them; nor do they appear to have so much consulted the best doctrines taught by the sacred writers, as the language and sentiments which the church of Rome has taken the liberty to put into their mouths. Several of the commentators rack their imaginations in order to force out of each passage of Scripture the four kinds of significations, called literal, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical, which ignorance and superstition had first invented and afterwards held so sacred in the explication of the inspired writings. Nor was their attachment to this manner of interpretation so ill managed, since it enabled them to make the sacred writers speak the language that was favorable to the views of the church, and to draw out of the Bible, with the help of a little subtlety, whatever doctrine they had a mind to impose upon the credulity of the multitude. p. 160

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE EXTRACTS.

1. The reformers in Luther's time did not depend upon impulses upon the mind, nor the delusions of fanaticism, nor upon internal illuminations, nor upon miracles, nor upon divine and special calls to the religious, nor upon extraordinary vocations; but they taught the human conscience of men—that the faith of christians was to be tried by God's word, and not by the creed nor by councils—they had recourse to reason, argument, criticism, and to history, to new translations—they taught men to break "*lawless yokes*," that christians were free

2. All the whole controversy between the Protestants and Roman Catholics, and between us and the modern Catholics are reducible to two points. The first is, Are the Scriptures the only rule of faith and practice? We say, Yes; the Catholics, ancient and modern, say (not *theoretically*, but *practically* they say no,) traditions or creeds are as necessary as Scripture. The second is, who is to judge of the sense of Scripture—the people or the clergy? We say, the people. The Catholics say, No; the clergy must interpret by making little idol gods for the people to see.

3. The arguments of ancient and modern Catholics are an open and injurious disparagement of the Scriptures; such as, "they are a dead letter," "they are lamphlack and paper," "poor little almanacs," "newspaper," "a sealed book," "a mysterious book." The second argument is oral tradition—the edicts or advisory councils of Pontiffs are superior to the Scriptures—you must obey man rather than God.

4. Cry up "the impenetrable obscurity," the gross errors, the shocking barbarities of style in the old translations, and cry down the new translations, however faithful, elegant, accurate, or plain.

5. Render the Bible obscure and useless through traditions and quadruple or four meanings, and make traditions all in all; praise the Holy Fathers; and dispraise the Apostles and Prophets of God; then call councils to back the decisions of the church or clergy, to uphold the church book, constitution, and long established customs of the Baptist society; then cry, "Splitting churches! Splitting churches! Destroying our constitution and order!"

These are some of the powerful arguments of Catholics Reformed. "The Baptists are a pure and spiritual people, poor and persecuted," and never drank any of the juice of the "poisonous berries"—which God's vineyard has produced, instead of bringing forth grapes, as he designed it should. Here is a fair sample of the arguments of Reformers and Anti-Reformers. It is denied that we are persecuted. We are not burnt at the stake, it is true; nor imprisoned, nor is our property confiscated, nor are we banished from the country; but for these favors we thank God and the laws of our country, and not our clergy; because the aphorism that "priests of all religions or sects are the same—they will be persecutors when they can," is not less ponderous than it is true. But we would ask, Is not the persecution of the tongue, to a tender, devout, conscientious, and ingenuous spirit, worse than that of the sword, and more difficult to be submitted to, because a good name is better than bodily life? Is there no persecution in being called Atheists, Deists, Socinians, Arians, Unitarians, Campbellites, Apostates, Pelagians, Sandemanians, H——? In being charged, contrary to fact and the most abundant testimony, of breaking open meeting-houses, splitting churches, creating discord, *et cetera?* In being "dropt" or cursed by advisory councils, shut out of meeting and private houses, sticks drawn upon us by the clergy, and then to be charged with all the fault and crime of these things, from one end of the nation to the other, in the papers? In being called buzzards, mice, flies, spiders, hogs, dogs, *et cetera?* These are blessings in disguise. This is not persecution; there is nothing in all this afflicting to a tender conscience! When the Judge of all makes inquisition for blood, will he not remember these things—will he forget the cry of the humble? Why should we persecute these people, seeing the root of the matter is found in them? AMOS.

A REMARKABLE ANALOGY

BETWEEN THE JEWISH DOCTORS AND THE MODERN CREED DOCTORS.

THE following piece is extracted from a late work, published by *Archibald Alexander*, of Princeton, New Jersey, titled "*The Bible Complete without the Apochrypha and Unwritten Traditions:*"—

"The Jews," says he, page 110, "place fully as much faith in the Talmud as they do in the Bible. Indeed, it is held in much greater esteem, and the reading of it is much more encouraged. It is a saying of one of their most esteemed Rabbis, that "the oral law is the foundation of the written; nor can the written law be expounded but by the oral." Agreeably to this, in their confession, called *The Golden Altar*, it is said, "It is impossible for us to stand upon the

foundation of our holy law, which is the written law, unless it be by the oral law, which is the exposition thereof. In the Talmud it is written, "that to give attention to the study of the Bible is some virtue; but he who pays attention to the study of the Mishna, possesses a virtue which shall receive a reward; and he who occupies himself in reading the Gemara, has a virtue than which there is none more excellent." Nay, they go to the impiety of saying, "that he who is employed in the study of the Bible and nothing else, does but waste his time." They maintain that if the declarations of this oral law be ever so inconsistent with reason and common sense, they must be received with implicit faith. "You must not depart from them," says Rabbi Sol Jarchi, "if they should assert that your right hand is your left, or your left hand your right." And in the Talmud it is taught that, "to sin against the words of the scribes is more grievous than to sin against the words of the law." The text of the Bible is like water, but the Mishna is like wine; with many other similar comparisons. Without the oral law, they assert, that the written law remains in perfect darkness; for, say they, "there are many things in Scripture which are contradictory, and which can in no way be reconciled but by the oral law which Moses received in Mount Sinai." Their learned men spend almost all their time in poring over the Talmud; and he among them who knows most of the contents of this monstrous farago of lies and nonsense, is esteemed the most learned man."

AMOS.

NOTES ON A TOUR TO NASHVILLE.

No. VII.

On Tuesday, the 28th December, after an affecting adieu to our brethren and friends in Nashville, we commenced our journey homewards. On Thursday, we delivered an address in Hopkinsville, Ky. to a large and attentive audience. One person, after the discourse, came forward, confessed the Lord, and was immersed. On the next day we spoke in Elkton. John Wilson, a zealous defender of Calvinism, and a very Regular Baptist, who presides over that diocess in the character of a monthly pastor, had vapored no little, as report said, about his ability to defend the citadel of orthodoxy against all assault. My topic of discourse at that place was Hebrews, 4th chapter, on the character of "the living and effectual word." He appeared willing to show his prowess; but on further trial his wife, who was convalescent from an attack of some sort, required his presence at home, and he could not stay for an evening meeting. After partaking of the hospitalities of Col. Buckner we proceeded, on the next day, to Russelville, where we spoke on the cloud of witnesses to the efficacy and excellency of faith as the great principle of action under the government of Jesus Christ. Two persons professed the faith, and were that same evening immersed by brother Adams.

We proceeded thence to Bowling Green, where we arrived in time for an evening meeting. Two friends, of the Quaker connexion, had assembled a congregation in the Court House, and Jeremiah Hubbard addressed them on the system of pure old fashioned spiritual Quakerism. We made some remarks, after he had done, on the call and mission of George Fox, the Baron Swedenborg, and many of the modern Apostles, who like our friend Hubbard were said to be moved by the Holy Spirit. The unreasonableness of any person pretending to such special calls and suggestions, unless they desired the people implicitly to receive their communications without further examination, was demonstrated.

On Monday morning, the 3d of January, we proceeded on our journey. Brother J. Creath having appointments in Fayette county, and I intending to visit Greensburgh, we were compelled to separate. After spending many very happy days together, we had to say farewell, and commend each other to the great Shepherd and Overseer of our souls. My daughter Eliza Ann was my only companion for the remainder of that week. On Tuesday evening we arrived at Greensburgh. We were courteously received and entertained by E. Creel, Esq. of this place, where we continued till Thursday morning. We had two meetings with the citizens on Wednesday. So little accustomed were they to believe that God meant what he said, or said what he meant, or that his word was to be acted upon promptly and implicitly, that none were prepared to obey it.

On Saturday evening we arrived via Danville at the house of our very affectionate and devoted brother Jos. Helm, sen. who has been for more than half a century a disciple of the great Teacher. He lamented that for forty years of that time he had been much incommoded in his enjoyments by the fogs of Calvinism. He has raised a very numerous and promising family. He introduced us to his *twenty-first* child, Washington, a lad about seven or eight years old. He rejoices with his amiable consort, and many of his children, in the liberty which is in Christ Jesus. A number of the disciples from the vicinity of Danville having assembled at brother Helm's, we spent a very agreeable evening.

On Lord's day, January 9th, we addressed a very large assembly in Lancaster, on the mission and prominent points of coincidence of the three great leaders of men, divinely commissioned. These were Moses, John, and Jesus. Two persons, after the discourse, came forward to confess the Lord. We spent the evening with brother William Jennings, at whose house another person came forward to make the good confession. Travelling with as much speed as the roads would permit, which at this time were very bad, we delivered addresses in the towns of Richmond, Winchester, Mount Sterling, Paris, North Middletown, Millersburg, May's Lick, and Maysville. Notwithstanding the roughness of the travelling, depth of snow, and coldness of the weather, congregations were generally large and attentive. Few incidents of much interest occurred at these meetings, as the time spent in each place generally was short. Two persons confessed the Lord at Winchester, walked some distance through the snow to the water, and were immersed by brother John Smith. A Methodist preacher, whose name I am now unable to record, after the address asked leave to bring forward a string of what he supposed to be heretical tenets, culled from the pages of the *Christian Baptist* and the *Harbinger*, which he wished to debate. An invitation had been given in the notice published by the brethren, to all persons who had any objections to make, to come and hear, and offer them while we were present to prevent misrepresentations afterwards. This notification, which had respect to the discourse to be offered, the gentleman converted into a license to submit the cullings of eight volumes as the subjects of discussion. The sun at this time was about one hour high, and my appointment required me to travel the next day to meet it!! If I remember right, one of the first items was something about "the Trinity," or "the doctrine of the Trinity," which he was apparently anxious to discuss. Soon discovering the calibre of his intellect, education, and the bent of his prejudices, we told the gentleman that if he had any thing to propose or object, or to inquire, touching the matters of the discourse delivered, we should hear him with all patience and attention; but if he had any thing to debate about Trinity or Unity, or any foreign topics, we would beg to be excused, as we always chose our opponent when we had any thing worthy of a formal discussion. After a little reconnoitering the gentleman withdrew, and we dismissed the assembly.

Whether owing to the coldness of the weather, the rapidity of our movements, or to the influence of the spirit of controversy in these sections of Kentucky, we found the community little disposed to submit to the government of Jesus Christ. It is true, there are many disciples heartily engaged in the reformation in all these counties—in some of them a majority of the professors in the

Baptist community; but the proscriptive measures of the enemies of reform had alienated the public ear from paying that regard to the authority and excellency of the christian religion, which, in other circumstances, they might have evinced, and which we saw exhibited in other places. Indeed, the great mass of the non-professing community have their feelings on the side of reform. Our opponents have produced this bias by the injustice, illiberality, and tyranny of their proceedings. The uncommitted and impartial spectators and auditors of their measures, have been so disgusted that few persons of discernment can ever enlist under their sectarian banners. The dull monotony of sectarian tenets, added to the unchristian temper and demeanor of their proclaimers and advocates, are never likely to have a strong hold on the affections of the rising generation The ignorance of the Christian and Jewish Scriptures, which abounds among those imbued with the spirits of the sectarian institutions, eminently disqualify the indoctrinated to hear or judge for themselves on the great questions which now agitate, and which for some time to come, must agitate, this community. Ignorance, Superstition, and Bigotry are handmaids to each other; and where the former is, the latter cannot be. Bigotry and Superstition are the offspring of Night. In an intelligent and well informed mind they can find no entertainment. And in proportion as any community becomes enlightened, these demons of discord are succeeded by Tolerance, Liberality, and True Devotion.

I was so continually in conversation when not addressing the public or travelling, that I was unable to make a single memorandum of the incidents on my return from Lancaster to the Ohio River. Many interesting conversations and pleasing interviews lightened the "tedium vitæ," the irksomeness of the way, and the intelligent zeal and devotion of many disciples gave a new impetus to my energies in the gospel which every where ascribes glory to God in the highest, produces peace on earth, and good will among men.

On Wednesday, the 26th of January, we crossed the Ohio River, much impeded by the floating ice, having been conducted to its shore by a number of the brethren, some of whom accompanied us for many days. Brethren Hewit and Nicholdson saw us safe into the state of Ohio, through which we passed with all possible speed, arriving at home on the evening of the 3d of February. Thus, under the kind and indulgent care of our Heavenly Father, we finished a tour of 1400 miles by land in one hundred days, without a single accident worthy of a name. During these 100 days we delivered about 70 public addresses, besides about twice that number of fireside lectures, and were the means of introducing more than 70 persons into the Kingdom of Jesus Christ. We found the same kind care and merciful providence had been extended over our family which had accompanied us by day and night through all the dangers and toils of a winter journey through a great variety of country and circumstances.

A considerable variety of fact, narrative and reflections, intended for these notes, is reserved for subsequent notices of the signs of the times and the state of the churches, which we promise in the numbers of the present volume.

EDITOR.

LETTER TO R. B. SEMPLE.

No. III.

DEAR SIR:

I COME now to that part of your letter in which you avow your predilections for the old version of the New Testament. This is not to be wondered at. Old men are generally fond of old times and old things. Though the latter house was to be, and did become more glorious than the first, yet the old men who saw the second Temple reared, shed tears when they remembered the first. The old men of England and Scotland preferred the good old Bishop's Bible, which

long use had consecrated, and pious meditation had endeared. They were as much opposed to the common version now in use, when it first appeared, as you are to the new version. They had not the same confidence in the King's translators which they had in the translators of Bishop's Bible; for men are wont to think the dead were more virtuous than the living, and our own times are always productive of men not to be trusted. The decree of the king which proscribed the then old version and legitimatized the common version, was regarded by many of the pious as cruelly proscriptive and illiberal.

The preface to the common version, published in the Christian Baptist, vol. 6, shows that all the objections which you have made to the new version were offered against the old, and repelled by the apologist for the king's version.

In addition to the reasons suggested in the prefaces to the new version, others might be adduced still farther illustrative of the actual necessity and utility of a new version. But as no person has attempted to show that these reasons are not good and valid, it appears superfluous to enforce them by auxiliary or additional considerations.

No man can translate a work which he does not understand. To understand the Greek language is one thing, and to translate any work in that language into another, is quite a different thing. *The most perfect knowledge of the Greek language which any man can possibly attain, will not qualify him to translate the New Testament, unless he understand the meaning of the book.* This the literati of the present day will at any time decide; indeed they have already decided it. Neither Homer nor Virgil, Demosthenes nor Cicero, can be translated without a perfect knowledge of their meaning, besides a perfect knowledge of the language which they wrote. Hence the numerous and diversified translations of these works, and their comparative merits as faithful representations of the original. Cowper's Homer, though less poetic, is a much fairer representation of the original than Pope's Homer. All the differences in translations arise, not so much from the lack of a perfect knowledge of the original tongues as from a perfect knowledge of the meaning of the works which have been translated.

I need not tell you that a Greek word is sometimes rendered into Latin, and a Latin word into English, by six or seven terms. Perhaps all the nouns and verbs would average five meanings. Often these meanings are much akin, but sometimes they are very dissimilar. Now will it not appear evident, that the translator in every instance, in selecting one of the *five*, will be governed by his own sense of the meaning of the writer, and in some measure by his taste? This single remark, the truth of which all must perceive, decides this question. I could, as you well know, give a thousand instances from either the Greek or Latin language, where the choice of one meaning in preference to another gives quite a different turn to the sense of a period or a discourse.

From all which it is plain that, to say the least, as much depends upon understanding the author, as the language in which he writes,

to qualify a translator to give a fair representation of the original Need I ask you now, whether the king's translators had this knowledge of the meaning of the book? Were they not as much warped by system as any of the sectaries of the present day?

The sects received the common version by a sort of political necessity, at first, and by the same necessity they still retain it, each of them finding fault with it in many instances. They agreed in retaining the version for the same reasons of union which govern them in a National Tract, or Sunday School concern, and they go to the same extent of co-operation in both. These are sober facts, which a little observation will furnish to the most common mind.

The authors of the new version were not so much under the influence of system as were the authors of the king's version. They were also furnished with much better means of understanding both the book and the language in which it was written, than were the king's translators. We do not say that they were perfectly acquainted with the meaning of the book, nor that any person now living is perfectly acquainted with it; but in the progress towards this perfection they were full *two centuries* in advance of the authors of the common version. This superiority is apparent on every page of the new version. We do, and must contend, that a version more correct than the common is as necessary to the full exhibition of christianity as a reformation of the professors of the present day—if not to the same extent, they are equally indispensable to this object.

On your principles, though the English language should change for two hundred years to come, as much as, or more than, during the two centuries past; and although the knowledge of christianity should continue to increase as it has done in a constant progression since the Protestant reformation, still the people must call nothing "*the New Testament*" but the king's version; nor, indeed, must they read any other. This is your position when fairly carried out. Let the people, "the common people," we say, have both. The publication of the new version, and the reading of it by the people, have done more to illuminate the public mind, as far as this version has been read, than all the commentaries of the last century. It has given a new impulse to their minds, and a healthy impulse. Do not interpose the authority of your name to nullify this happy influence.

We have courted objections to the new version, and solicited discussion upon its merits. They have been refused. Nothing candid, nothing argumentative, has as yet appeared. We have been sparing in finding faults with the common version, on two accounts: first, because comparatively few have access to any other; and in the second place, because some are accustomed to allege that we desire a disparagement of the old, that we may introduce some favorite points, to which the old is not so favorable as the new version. The latter insinuation we have often repelled, by stating that we contend for no point of importance that cannot be well sustained from the common version. But our silence upon the numerous defects and errors in the common version, is not because we have not discovered, or are una-

ble to exhibit them. When called to this task we shall not, we pledge ourselves, be found wanting.

But, sir, give me leave to tell you that we have not the king's version as the translators gave it. Many changes have been silently introduced, and there is a great difference between the old copies of the king's version and the new impressions of it. To make one sweeping specification, all the marginal readings which are of the same authority with the text, as emanating from the same source, are expunged from the copies now generally in use. This is a liberty which has been taken without any act of Parliament, or any convention of the clergy of which we are informed.

Your second letter has been received, and will appear in our next. My apology for not publishing it in this number, is, that I wish to finish my remarks upon that under consideration. I have now adverted to all its prominent items.

I do complain, and the present generation are witnesses how justly I complain, that I have never had an argumentative opponent on any one of the great questions discussed in the Christian Baptist, or in this work. For many, like yourself, my dear sir, rely upon having the popular current in their favor, or upon their standing with the people; and no man seems disposed and prepared to submit himself to the arena of scripture, sound logic, or good common sense; to strip himself of all the adventitious allies which he has in the prejudices of the people; and to place himself upon the same level with myself. Yet, with all the disadvantages under which we are oppressed, we rejoice that many minds are relieved from slavish systems; and that notwithstanding the fearful odds against us, the reformation advances with a steady and firm pace. Desirous of a continuation of your favors, I remain your sincere friend and obedient servant.

EDITOR.

APOLOGY TO VINDEX.

YOUR details concerning the Editor of the *Baptist Chronicle* are unnecessary out of Kentucky; and if it be a fact that he attempted, in the face of his own county, to ruin the reputation of his own brother for the sake of getting his office of Clerk of the Court, the Baptists of Kentucky, knowing this, need not be reminded of it, by an *expose* of his proceedings in that case. Neither can I consent to publish any thing, even from my correspondents, in vindication of myself, or any one else, from his vulgar and scurrilous abuse. We have shown to all who have eyes, that himself and his paper are beneath contempt, and just such a vehicle as the enemies of reform required to transport their *manufactures* to a suitable market. Let not the friends of reform place themselves upon a level with the calumniators of this age. Whenever a person, professing any form of religion, calls an apponent *"a liar"* because he reasons differently on facts, or infers from them something at variance with his conclusions; or without any evidence, reason, or occasion, other than his own malignity, he puts himself out of the pale of all communion and regard, religious, moral, or civil; and he that touches him pollutes himself. Our friend *Vindex* will, therefore, excuse us for not publishing his communications on this subject. On any *principles* or views within the purview of this paper, we shall be glad to hear from him; but to vindicate any one from the abuse of the *Baptist Chronicle*, is rather to deprive virtue of its reward, than to diminish the virulence of that relentless fury whose

sole delight is to anathematize, proscribe, and defame every one who bows not to the image for which he manufactures the silver shrines. Let the friends of reform be true to themselves, and the *Chronicle*, "like the scorpion confined within a circle of fire, will sting itself to death." EDITOR.

REJECTION OF THE SEMPLE AND BROADDUS DECREES.

THE Semple and Broaddus Decrees were rejected by Mr. Semple's own church at Bruington, on the 5th of March. That very church, which, it is said, was so aggrieved at the spread of our views as to justify R. B. Semple and Andrew Broaddus in calling a council to proscribe us; that very church, which, it is said, the mover of these decrees planted, and in which he has labored for so many years, has done itself the honor to reject the decrees of the elders. Thus, as our correspondent remarks, "has the sceptre departed from Judah and a lawgiver from Dover."

The number of professors and non-professors which attended this meeting, made it resemble, we are informed, an association rather than a church. Brother Duval, an able and eloquent pleader of the cause of the New Testament, exposed the doctrine of the Semple and Broaddus Decrees. Several correspondents inform us that the defence of brother Duval was powerful and eloquent—his *expose* of the injustice done us in the decrees, lucid and convincing. Andrew Broaddus, who was invited to aid R. B. Semple in his own church, arose and said, that he would not formally reply to Dr. Duval's speech, but would make a few remarks. He, however, took out of his hat his manuscript reply to the *Extra, No.* 1, and read some pages of it; the pith of which was to show that a man is justified, sanctified, and adopted, before he obeys the Lord in immersion. After he sat down, Dr. Duval arose to reply; but was forbidden by our good brother Semple.

The church was now convened. Every white male member present, save one, who was sick. One *was sent for* who had applied for a letter *twelve months before*, and who had lived two or three years in another county. The decrees were then read. "They were," to use the word of our correspondent, "then picked to pieces" by Dr. Duval. Messrs. Todd, Broaddus, and Semple, used all their talents, eloquence, and authority, to induce the church to receive them and enter them on the church book. But the church would not hear them. So much were they aggrieved with the spread of this leprosy, which our opponents have nicknamed *Campbellism!!*

R. B. Semple then insisted upon his "opponents," those who would not vote with him to take letters of dismission, and join some other church. But this they would not do! He then ordered every man's name to be written down and called over, so that each man would answer and record his vote. They continued firm, and gave their vote in writing against the decrees. He then moved a *postponement* of the business of the meeting which was now finished?!! The brethren voting against the resolutions were immoveable. He then proposed to *modify* the resolutions. But they would not have even a modification of them.

Six of the ministers who were in the convention were present. Bishop Semple then remarked in the presence of all, that if they had put the resolutions on the church book no split in the church would have taken place; but now a split must be the consequence. He was informed if there would be a split, the fault, if any, would be his. The ingenuity of the priesthood being exhausted, and the brethren remaining firm and immoveable, the meeting broke up, and so ended the affair.

The next day Messrs. Semple and Broaddus preached to the people human inability and sovereign grace, and then invited sinners to come. And, to crown the whole, they broke the loaf together, reformers and antireformers. All, except one who voted against the resolutions, partook with them. The good old Bishop's heart relented—he shed many tears—and they had quite "a fine time." What a blessing, then, that peace and union were preserved in spite of the efforts of these worthy sectarians to create divisions!

This is a fair sample of the way all the divisions are produced. Our mistaken opponents create them, and then charge them upon us.

Now I would ask my friends Semple and Broaddus, for I still regard them as friends, though opposing us, (they do it ignorantly, or, what is the same thing, through old prejudices of many years growth,) I would ask them why complain that their churches are aggrieved with the spread of this old heresy which Paul preached, now, indeed, a new doctrine? The church of which my correspondent is a member, consists of from three to four hundred members, only *two* of which are opposed to reform; or rather the whole church, with the exception of two, are hearty in the cause. And did not Andrew Broaddus say at Bruington, that not one of his members thought with us! If so, they cannot be aggrieved among themselves!

I will say one word to these old brethren. Cease your opposition to the ancient gospel, take Gamaliel's advice, and the disciples will forgive you all you have done.

EDITOR.

REVIVAL IN GEORGETOWN, KENTUCKY.

THE honorable John T. Johnson, brother of the author of the Report on Sunday Mails, a very intelligent and amiable disciple of the Great Teacher, has come out boldly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. As Rowland Hill once said to a Scotch nobleman who became a proclaimer of reformation, so I would say to brother Johnson; "Sir, in *descending* from the forum and legislative hall to proclaim a crucified Saviour, you have *ascended* far above all earthly crowns in the estimation of all good men on earth, and of all the angels in heaven: more glorious far in being an humble proclaimer of righteousness, than ever was a monarch seated on an ivory throne placed on the backs of twelve golden lions."

The talents and standing of brother Johnson, adorned with the christian graces, arrayed in defence of the ancient gospel, have already been successfully employed in proclaiming that word which sounded out from Jerusalem on the morning of the ever-memorable Pentecost.

A correspondent under date of the 13th March, writes me as follows:—

"*Dear brother Campbell*—On last Saturday a small church was constituted at the Great Crossings, Scott county, 'as the disciples of Jesus Christ their Lord and Saviour, submitting themselves to his heavenly authority in all things, and holding to the divine scriptures of truth as contained in the Old and New Testaments, as being alone the all-sufficient authority and guide for their instruction, edification, faith, and obedience.'

"Brother John T. Johnson was appointed by the little congregation as a teacher, and to take the lead in the administration of the ordinances. In some short time after the organization of the church, an opportunity was afforded for any present to make the good confession, &c. and Joel Johnson, the brother of John T. Johnson, stated that he had been deeply concerned for some two years upon the subject of religion; that he believed that Jesus Christ was the only Saviour of sinners, and that he believed with all his heart that he was the Son of God, and desired to be immersed for the remission of sins. Mrs. Sophia Johnson, the wife of brother John T. Johnson, made a similar statement; and on Sunday morning the little congregation again met, and Mrs. Joel Johnson was received upon the good confession, and a Mr. John Ludliff was also received; and after a very animated discourse from brother John T. Johnson, he had the happiness of immersing his own dear companion, an amiable brother, and his companion, in Elkhorn, for remission of sins. Brother Ludliff, not being prepared, was not immersed.

"The prospects for doing much good are truly flattering. The people generally seem to take a deep and lively interest for the cause of reformation, and I think that recent indications are very favorable.

"We should rejoice much to have your company and aid a few days this Spring at the Crossings; it is an important point, and we are persuaded that great benefit would result from your visit. Brother Johnson is a fine speaker, and is truly zealous in the good cause.

"Your brother in Christ, "B. S."

In calling this *"a revival,"* I speak in some sense after the manner of modern men. The "revival of literature," and the "revival of religion," are phrases specifically the same; and, when used in this acceptation, may be harmless. Literature had been dead and buried for ages before the Reformation. It was then resuscitated. In reference to Georgetown, Ky. since the crusade against reform commenced, the above incidents deserve to be called *a revival.* If it were not a great license of speech, I would say that the doings of the antireformers in that place, since the conception and birth of the "*Literary Register* & *Baptist Chronicle*," have been a revival of irreligion. The recent occurrences in that place are like a refreshing shower in a long drought upon a parched soil. My prayer is, that the good work begun in that place may progress until the works of the Man of Sin be consumed, and till all who are determined for eternal life shall obey the gospel, and stand erect in the liberty with which Christ has made his people free. The Lord's freemen are free indeed! EDITOR.

Communicated for the Millennial Harbinger.

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL:

SIR—In the Baptist Chronicle, printed in Georgetown, for November, 1830, No. 11. vol. 1 p. 162, there commences a piece over the signature of "Juvenis," "On the remission of sins in Baptism." So soon as this writer, "Juvenis," made his appearance, public conjecture was on tiptoe to find out the real name of this *young* author. After some days' conjecture, suspicion fell on Mr. Bacon, the Principal of the Georgetown Classical and Theological School. I am a friend to this School, and therefore do sincerely wish it all honorable success. Hearing it hinted that Mr. Bacon was suspected of dipping into theological controversy, and that deeply, on a subject that, in my humble opinion, (though I am a member of a sectarian church) demands our *most serious attention*, I began to have some unpropitious cogitations for the prosperity of this rising Infant School. I came to the conclusion, on serious reflection too, that if the principal of this School had, so early after his elevation to its head, entered the field, sword in hand, to defend sectarianism, (be his private sentiments what they may) there were just grounds for every reflecting man to doubt the long continuance and prosperity of this institution; nor, sir, have I in the least changed my opinion upon this subject. When your periodical (the Millennial Harbinger) came, No. I. vol. 2, for January, 1831, I soon found that public report had reached you, and that you entertained the same suspicion. So soon as this took place, Mr. Bacon came out, and positively denies being the author of 'Juvenis.' This gave me considerable pleasure and satisfaction. Public conjecture was again put in requisition to find out the proper name of 'Juvenis;' and I believe, sir, it is now pretty generally understood, yes believed, that this young man 'Juvenis' is between forty-five and fifty years old; that, like the Cameleon, he is sometimes a farmer, sometimes a lawyer, sometimes a judge in one of our courts, sometimes a Doctor of Medicine, sometimes a Calvinistic preacher, sometimes an Armenian, sometimes a Baptist Reformer, constituting churches on the New Testament alone, and as oftentimes nothing as any of these. He is nicknamed Sanballat, but is better known as the Dr. of Oakley. Now, Sir, I am of opinion that you will think it nothing more than justice to our School and its principal, Mr. Bacon, to give this a place in your paper.

Before I close this communication, I think proper to inform you a little further in relation to this Mr. 'Juvenis.' He is the gentleman who appeared in the called Franklin Association, which sat on the 9th of July last, and made a bold

effort to have a resolution passed to prevent the reading of your writings by the Baptists in that honorable body, but failed. Since that Sanhedrim sat, and not long since, he was visited by an old disciple, who on entering his room discovered the Millennial Harbinger lying on his table. "Ah!" said the old gentleman, "I thought you tried hard last year in the Called Franklin Association to suppress the reading of Campbell's writings." "Yes," replied he, with much confusion, "but I heard that Mr. Campbell had said something in the Harbinger about me, and I thought I would get it and see what it was. I intend, however," continued he, "so soon as the roads get better, to turn out and travel through Franklin, Versailles, and Garrard, and blow Campbellism out of the whole country." Therefore, Mr. Editor, permit me, though yet under sectarian shackles myself, to caution you to make ready for your ecclesiastical demise, FOR SANBALLAT IS COMING. Again, sir, suggesting to you the propriety of publishing this as an act of juctice to our School, &c. I subscribe myself,

Yours, &c. NO JUVENIS.

WILLIAM VAUGHN, AND IMPRECATIONS.

My remerks in the 10th No. vol. 1. p. 478, concerning a report circulated by William Vaughn, imputing to me an attempt to bribe him to plead the cause of reform, has drawn from him a column of abuse in the Baptist Chronicle for March last. His abuse is mingled with solemn asseverations that my mentioning to him in a private conversation, in Maysville, May, 1830, the liberality of the reformers, was, in effect, offering to him a bribe.

Not supposing that William Vaughn was governed by the most punctilious regard for what men of honor call honorable and high-minded rules of action, I ought not to accuse him of a departure from those rules in divulging any thing said to him in a private conversation, when it was so much to his own praise to proclaim it! And as he is now opposed to reformation, I ought not to complain of him for reporting what was never said, nor for misrepresenting what was said! I have, then, no right to censure him, but only to show that his solemn protestations, appended to his former misstatements, cannot, to any man of candor, make his tale even feasible.

It is, indeed, an unpleasant case, when two persons contradict each other in a matter which transpired between themselves alone, and have nothing to sustain them but their own reputation for veracity, and the probabilities and circumstances of the affair. I am, however, more fortunate in this case than is usual in such cases, having collateral aids and vouchers in the conduct of my accuser, as the sequel will show.

'Tis seldom that persons addicted to confirm their sayings by an oath, or some solemn invocation, are distinguished for veracity, or for a strict regard to truth. In their own judgment, their word requires confirmation; and unfortunately for their credit, their asseverations and their sayings are always ex parte, or from the same source, and cannot corroborate each other. The credibility of such men is in the inverse ratio of the frequency and familiarity with which they call God to witness.

When a person presents more than his *yes*, or *no*, before he is asked for a confirmation, he not only violates the command of the Saviour, but impeaches himself. In tendering unsolicited his imprecations and appeals in corroboration of his simple word, he creates a suspicion in the mind of the discerning; because he shows that in his own judgment his word ought not to be taken.

Daring as it is to profess to swear from recollection to the particulars of a conversation seven months after it transpired, it is still more daring to profess a willingness to swear to the purpose or motives which governed another in using any particular argument or phrase. My memory is at least at par with persons of my age, excepting in the names of dates, persons, and places, and it is not once in a hundred times that I would presume positively to affirm the items of any conversation three months after it happened. And seldom or ever

could I positively aver, much less swear to the purpose, or motive, or object for which any thing is said.

It is now nearly twelve months since that interview, and I could at this time only swear that, to the best of my recollection, the three periods given in the Chronicle neither contain the outlines nor give the true purport of a conversation of at least three quarters of an hour.

Two of his appeals to Heaven may be the truth, for aught I know, or any thing I have said in my remarks, vol. 1, p. 478. Whether I named the Christian Baptist at that time, or on any other occasion spoke to him of the liberality of the reformers, affects not the question at all. But to use the words of the passage in question, which fact I then had in my mind, "He was wont to complain to me, on sundry occasions, of the want of liberality in the Baptists to their preachers, and expressed his fears that my remarks in the C. B. would dry up the last percolations of liberality towads their preachers." That *he was wont* so to do, not only in private, but in the presence of others, I think can be sustained by as many witnesses as the Jewish law required to substantiate any crime. That he was very sensitive upon this subject I think a number of the citizens of Mason county, Kentucky, can, if necessary, attest. But to say that I used the word liberality for the purpose, express or implied, of inducing him to desist his opposition to reform, is an affirmation, make it when he may, without any other authority than his own inference and assertion. He may swear to his own inference; but if he swear to my purpose, object, or motive, no man of sense can believe him.

The conversation alluded to originated thus:—I had immersed five persons in the river at Maysville. William Vaughn was a spectator. Coming up from the river, I affirm that he said in the full import of the following words: "No person can condemn from the scriptures that mode of procedure, yet I do not like it." We dined at Dr. Shackleford's. That remark at the river, and other matters, induced me to wish a private conversation with him. I presume not now to give the details farther than I have done when the matter was fresher in my memory; but I will only add, that it would have been a renunciation of all my public avowals and personal feelings, to attempt, by an appeal to pecuniary interest, to allure a *mercenary* individual into the ranks of reform, which, *on his hypothesis*, I must have supposed him to be. Moreover, knowing him to be an opponent, it would have been a weakness of which I am not often accused, to put into the hands of such a person a weapon to wield against the cause I plead.

But since that time William Vaughn has given public proof that, virtuous as I once thought he was, and as *he says* he is, he has his price; and that if I attempted to hire him, I only failed in offering him the liberality of the reformers: for he has now deserted his Bishoprick, and has become a pedestrian or equestrian agent for the Sunday School monopoly, at a safer salary of some five or six hundred dollars a year. This was to him a more convincing argument than the liberality of the reformers!

I will not even yet say, from all that has since occurred, that he regards solely the loaves and fishes; but one thing I know, and many can attest it, that he has complained as much of the want of liberality to himself, and sought as ardently a remuneration for his sermons, as most men in the Baptist connection, or out of it. But on no principle except that of an alienated and perverted mind can I explain his perversions of a conversation intended to show him the error of his way, nor his willingness to confirm, by imprecations and solemn protestations, not only his recollections, but even the purposes and motives which actuated me. But as he has frequently been challenged for contradictions and denials, I would rather ascribe it to the spiritual jaundice under which he groans, or the faithlessness of his memory, than to a desperate disregard of truth, or a settled determination to misrepresent and arraign those whom he dislikes, because he has given them cause to think lightly of himself. I have known not a few instances, among which his own case is registered, of persons who were alienated from their friends, for no assignable

reason but because they had given cause to their friends to complain against them.

No person, in Kentucky, was once more familiar with me than this same William Vaughn. He was a confidential friend, much in my company, and knew as much of my motives, objects, and principles of action, as any man in that commonwealth. And now that he has joined the priesthood and become an opponent, it is some consolation that he has not aught to accuse me save that I now affirm he gave a false representation of a benevolent interview which I had with him, which I still affirm with all the confidence of my recollections and convictions.

EDITOR.

ANTIREFORM MORALITY.

SEVERAL communications respecting the Baptist Chronicle have been received by the last two mails. Various disclosures, placing that paper and its editors in a very unenviable position, are before us; none of which we can now publish. The following alone will justify us in this course. It shows what may be expected from that fountain. If such representations are made in mere trifles, what may we expect in greater matters?—!

Bloomfield, Nelson county, Ky. March 24, 1831.

MR. CAMPBELL:

The last (March) No. of the Baptist Chronicle contains an extract from a letter of mine in these words:

"*Extract from Bro. Samuel McKay, dated Bloomfield, Ky. March 3d, 1831.*

"BRO. CHAMBERS:—Mr. Campbell had twelve subscribers here last year. They have nearly all ordered a discontinuance, &c."

This, you will see, is not exactly true. My Clerk, who is also a Deputy in the Post Office, had informed me, months before, that you had about 12 subscribers. I had not counted them myself, but judged from the packets that there were at least that number. I, however, upon particular examination, found that you had but eleven. But this is not the worst—I wrote that most of these subscribers had ordered a discontinuance, when only five out of eleven had done so. When I wrote the above extract, I was not particular—I never expected to see or hear of it again; (it was, I thought, private and confidential.) It was in reply to a letter and prospectus from Mr. Chambers, in which I was showing a manifest disposition on the part of the brethren here not to encourage either of your periodicals, owing to their controversial character.

When I wrote the letter to Mr. Chambers from which the extract was taken, it was my impression from the applications made for discontinuance some time before, that you were both about losing nearly all of your subscribers here. Therefore, notwithstanding the above acknowledgment, I do not in any way feel convicted of any improper conduct in the matter.

If you notice this small matter at all, you will please publish the above, as I might otherwise be placed in an awkward dilemma.

Very respectfully, yours, &c. SAMUEL McKAY.

The fact is, with all the discontinuances on our list up to this date received, we send *eight* copies of vol. 2 to Bloomfield. Let no person expect me hereafter to contradict any thing asserted upon the individual responsibility of Uriel Chambers. ED.

THE LIVING AND EFFECTUAL WORD.

We have more than once said, and, perhaps, more than twice written, that our attention has been arrested to the fact, that the ancient gospel has been believed and obeyed by a much greater proportion of learned and intelligent persons in the whole aggregate amount of those who have received it, than we have ever known or witnessed to yield obedience to any of the sectarian gospels of this our day and generation.

The following extract from a correspondent, an able and intelligent member of the Kentucky Bar, alike exhibits the impotency and evil tendency of human gospels, and the simplicity, power, and excellency of the gospel of God our Saviour. Many a person of intelligence and honesty like him, have not only been kept out of the kingdom many years. but all their lives; who, if they had heard and understood the New Constitution of the Christian King, would have vowed allegiance and been ornaments to the christian profession, and public benefactors through the influence of a good and virtuous example. I rejoice with this brother in the joy which he has in the Lord. During my debate with Mr. McCalla, I formed a special acquaintance with him. I anxiously desired his salvation, for his own sake, for the sake of a most promising and interesting rising family, and for the sake of his amiable consort, who has for many years been a fearless and guileless disciple of the Lord, the King of Glory. He professed the faith, and was immersed by my father in October last, is now an active member of the church, and we are authorized to expect that he will be still more active in the service of One to whom he owes himself by a debt of love which the countless ages of eternity can never cancel. Ed.

"I am happier than at any former period of my life; and I have never had any thing to make me unhappy, more than falls to the common lot of man. Many of the good things of this life, which others do not enjoy in as great a degree, you know, falls to my portion. But I will not boast in any thing but Christ; and in him I think a disciple, who has obeyed with an honest and sincere heart, may be allowed to boast. Every body who knows me, knows also, if they would speak the truth, that I have not been changing with every wind of doctrine; that I have all my life time had a desire to believe the Bible to be the Word of God; and so often have I expressed myself thus, that it was no secret among deists, as well as christians: but the latter always deceived me by telling me that God in his *own* way and appointed time would bring me to *know* and *feel* his *grace*, while at the same moment I had his *Word* in my *house*, and in my heart too; and a thousand times would I have spoken it, and confessed him with my mouth, if it had not been for the priests and teachers of the day. But thank God I have had resolution to make the confession in my old age, and that before I leave this world for a fairer world to come. An opportunity is given me to repent of the evil I have done, and to point others to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world—to point them to his *Word*, that was written that we might believe. I have had doubts ever since your debate with Mr. McCalla. Before that time I tried how many smart things I could say against the christian scheme. I attended the debate with Mr. Owen, that I might hear *both sides*, and have read it since more than once. Indeed, with all my other pursuits, I have for years turned my attention to history, and not entirely neglected the scriptures themselves, to find out, if possible. whether these things were so—and I am

happy in believing them—and that is the *end* and *aim* of all. And if nothing but the Word of God had ever been given to me, and no teacher *called and sent*, as they said, *by God*, to explain it, I am of opinion that I should have been happy many years ago."

ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS CORRECTED.

WE the Baptist Church of Jesus Christ, in Louisville, deeply regretting the unhappy division which took place at our October meeting, contrary to our desire or approbation, and in despite of our united efforts to prevent it; and on account of the turbulence and disorder attending it, so disgraceful to that Holy Religion which we profess; which has given rise to many unfair statements and false charges, calculated and designed to mislead the mind of the public, and prejudice the feelings of our brethren against us, by styling us *Campbellites*, under which name we are charged with believing and practising many dangerous and heretical doctrines: such as, that the Old Testament is abrogated, and of no more use; that no one is authorised of Heaven to preach the Gospel since the days of the Apostles; that we deny christian experience, and the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of the soul, or in order to becoming a christian; that any person, by reading the Scriptures, and *barely saying* he believes in Jesus Christ, and by being immersed in water, is born again; that no person can be saved who cannot *read* the Holy Scriptures, or who is not immersed, and that we are opposed to associating with our sister churches, to church records, or church discipline, or church order, &c. &c. all of which charges we deny, and aver that they are false, and unfounded; and we would have our brethren, and the public generally, to give them no credence whatever. We cheerfully acknowledge that we do entertain the common christian love and respect for brother Alex. Campbell; and while he continues a worthy and exemplary disciple of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is our desire to cultivate the same good will towards him, and all others whose conduct merits it. Moreover, we do believe he has ably defended and supported the truth of christian immersion, and with a masterly hand refuted the traditional custom of infant baptism, and infant sprinkling, in his debates with Messrs. Walker and McCalla; and more especially his successful defence of christianity against the formidable attacks of Robert Owen and other modern sceptics, and on many other topics as a writer and a christian Teacher, he has displayed great energy in advocating the faith and order of the ancient Apostolic Gospel: on account of those laudible exertions which he has made to revive and unfold primitive christianity, justice and honesty forbid our joining with his enemies in a crusade against him, in denouncing him as a "heretic," "deceiver," "impostor," &c. and in refusing to shut our doors against him, thereby denying him common civility and hospitality.

Yet we refuse most obstinately to be called by his name, or that he shall be styled our Master or Leader. We do vehemently protest

against, and unequivocally *renounce*, Campbellism,* Fullerism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Unitarianism, and every other human "ism" *toto cælo*, which the mystery of iniquity has introduced into the christian world, and hereby publish to the world the following asseverations: That we do from our heart believe and receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the only Word of the Living God given to man for his salvation, and that the New Testament is the only divinely authorised constitution, rule, and directory of faith and practice of the christian church; and we, having been immersed upon the profession of our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, do acknowledge him, and *him only*, to be our Prophet, Priest, and King, our *only Lord* and *Master*, to whose authority we feel ourselves bound to submit in all things whatever he has commanded. And we would further state, that we have no wish or intention to separate from the General Union of the Baptists in Kentucky, or from the Long Run Association, and that we have no wish to change the constitution on which we have stood for several years. We would also state, that for many of those who have swerved from us we still feel the most tender affection as the disciples of Jesus Christ, and while we do wish grace, mercy, and peace to be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, we will strive to live in peace with all men so far as in us lies.

Done by order of the Church in session, December 25th, 1830.

BENJ. ALLEN, *Moderator.*

JOHN BLEDSOE, *Clerk.*

ANECDOTE OF GEORGE THE THIRD.

"He sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not."

IN illustration of the doctrine in this clause (says Dr. Adam Clarke) I will introduce one fact, which I had from high authority:—

His late Majesty, *George III.* was very fond of children. Often in his walks both about Windsor and St. James' Park, he would stop when he saw an interesting child, and speak kindly and affectionately to it, give it some little toy or sweetmeat, and often a piece of money. One day observing a little lad about four years old, who seemed to have strayed away from his fellows, he addressed it, and finding it intelligent for its age, he took it by the hand, and led it towards the palace, the child nothing loath. He brought the little fellow into the Queen's apartment, and presented it to her, with "Here, Queen, here is a very little boy that I have picked up in my walk," and then addressing the lad, "That's the Queen, my dear—bow to her" A chair was immediately brought; the little fellow was seated on it, and in a trice some sweetmeats and fruits were laid before him.—Little master felt himself quite at home, ate freely, and endeavored to answer every question that was put to him. Before he was removed from his chair, the King took out a new guinea, and placed it before him, saying, "Here, my dear, is a pretty thing which I will give

* This is just what it ought to be. I renounced myself when I vowed allegiance to the Lord. Shall he become a leader of others who dare not follow himself, but has vowed to follow the Lord! ED. M. H.

you." The child looked at it for some time, and then with his finger pushed it away on the table, saying, "*I don't know it—I won't have it*," and looked indifferently over the table. The King said, "Well, my dear, if you won't have this, what will you have? Come, tell me what you'll have, and I'll give it to you." There were several papers of a very important nature then lying on the table, which had lately been brought into the royal apartment. The child looking earnestly at one, said, "I'll have that pretty picture," and put his hands towards it. The King looked confounded, and hesitated; the Queen for a time was equally surprized; but she first broke silence, (the child having then his *pretty picture* in his hand, which was no other than a new *bank note for a very large amount!*) and said, "He must have it—your Majesty's word is passed—your royal promise cannot be recalled." The King, with great good humor, assented, with, "Yes, yes, he shall have it." A faithful domestic was called, the child delivered to him, with the injunction to take him back to the Park, find out his playmates or nurse, and follow their directions till he should find the dwelling and parents of the child, nothing of either being known to his Majesty or domestics. The servant was successful, delivered the child and his *pretty picture* to the astonished father and mother; returned, and gave such an account to the royal pair, as satisfied them that, while his Majesty *had sworn to his own hurt*, and would *not change*, a wise Providence had directed the whole transaction.

PARTICULAR BAPTISTS.

THE following precious and sweet morsel of pure, unsophisticated Calvinism, fell into my hands this morning. It is the corresponding letter of the Licking Association of Particular Baptists, for the year 1830. The Statistics of this Association are the following, taken from the Minutes before me:—14 ordained preachers; baptized last year, 50 persons; dismissed, 125; died, 26; excluded, 5; total number, 1400; decreased, last year, 24. *Thirty* churches in all.

In their circular letter they glory in "unfrustable grace," "immediate and irresistible operations of the Holy Spirit," and pray that "God would make us all practically *Particular Baptists*," and help them only to prove their discipleship. But hear their corresponding letter:—

"*The Licking Association of Particular Baptists, now in session at Friendship Meeting-House—to the Associations with whom we correspond—wish grace, mercy, and peace:—*

BELOVED IN THE LORD,

We have been permitted again to assemble as an Association, and rejoice to find, from the tenor of the letters from the churches composing this body, that much harmony, and perfect unanimity upon the principles of truth, as developed in the Constitution of our Association, exists. The Psalmist says, *He fashioneth their hearts alike.* Our astonishment at the unprecedented oneness of language spoken by our churches, is only explained in the fact that *He* (Jehovah) *holds the heart of the King in his hand, and can turn it whithersoever he please, as the rivers of waters are turned.* Brethren, although there has been a flood of error poured in upon the Baptists of our country, and though many seem disposed to

follow the pernicious ways of those ambassadors of Satan: yet, brethren, Zion has no cause to fear; but when she is thoroughly tried she will come forth as gold; much of her dross may be taken away by our modern reformers, or, more appropriately, *deformers;* and hence we should not consider it a severe dispensation of the providence of God towards us, if it shall eventuate in purging of the church of her antichristian lumber. Brethren, we rejoice to find there is yet a redeeming spirit in the Zion of our God; and that, although she has been dosing until Antichrist made considerable encroachment, yet the trumpet has been sounded—she has awoke and risen in the majesty of the strength of Israel's God, and proclaimed that Sandemanianism should not live among them. We say, So far, so good. But, brethren, there remains to be purged more dross. We have about as much fellowship for John Glass's system as for Mr. Fuller's, if Mr. Fuller believes (as his advocates say he does) in a general atonement and special application. What is the exposition of this nondescript? God has laid a foundation as large as the posterity of Adam the first in extenso, and his Spirit will only prepare materials (special application) enough to build a house of not half the dimensions of the original foundation; consequently, a large portion of the foundation is entirely useless. Does this comport with your ideas of him who declares he *is a rock and his work is perfect?* Brethren, salvation is either of grace or it is of works, and it is high time for christians to take the one side or the other. The ridge-pole is a dangerous hobby to be ridden, and he must be a very skilful rider who can keep his seat long upon it. We have nothing to lose in declaring our firm conviction that salvation is wholly of grace; and the salvation of every sinner who has been, is, or ever will be saved, is the result of their being chosen in the Lord Jesus before the world began; they being so connected with him as to render him responsible for their debts; the payment by the Surety, and consequent release by the blessed Holy Spirit; and that all such will ultimately hear the welcome of, *Enter thou into the joys of thy Lord.* O, brethren! may we be watching and waiting the second coming of the Bridegroom, and hail his advent with, *Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!* is our prayer for Jesus' sake."

This is as full of stoicism as Owenism. They are a happy people. Fourteen ordained preachers, with the aid of 1400 of the elect disciples, were the instruments of converting 3 souls and a fraction per preacher, per annum. But this is just as good news as could be told: for these are all that God would have converted. As a preacher in the Goshen Association once said, "God, my beloved, has just as many souls here as he wants to have converted; and next year when we assemble there will just be as many christians as God wants."

But they are fatalists only in religion—not in the affairs of this world. They cultivate large farms; buy and sell houses, lands, and Negroes; rise early, and sit late; trade and get gain; and the man who sows most, ploughs most, and works the largest number of hands, expects the largest share of the good things of this world. The Particulars are for *grace in the next world*, and for *works in the present*. They are, in reference to the present world, Arminians; and as respects the next, Calvinists. They are generally opposed to reformation, and unwilling that we should reform the non-elect: as for the elect, we cannot deceive them. They are secure of life eternal. The non-elect are those which we can deceive. If we could deceive them into good morals and make them good citizens, would we deserve to be called "ambassadors of Satan?"

These folks boast of unanimity and peace. So might the Holy Mother Church. And, indeed, they have as much reason to be at

peace as those who mingle ashes in a gravevard. These disciples have only to watch and wait for salvation, as Messrs. Dudley, Dillard, Corban & Co. advise and consort. EDITOR.

Danville, Ky. Nov. 1830.

THE CHEMUNG BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

THE Chemung Baptist Association which met in Bradford county, Pennsylvania, August 6—7, 1830, composed of 652 members, have in twelve months received only four members by immersion. Seven in that time died, and 42 were excluded. Their circular letter was a denunciation against some scraps extracted from the Christian Baptist which it seems not a soul of them understood; and I presume the reason is, not one of the denouncers ever read a volume, nor, perhaps, a single number, of the Christian Baptist. There are four ordained ministers and two licentiates in this Association. They are very orthodox, and as a proof it, the *six* preachers in one year were instrumental in baptizing *four* persons!! But they are not in Babylon. They live in Jerusalem where they are all christians, all at least whom God wills TO BE christians! EDITOR.

CHALLENGE.

From the Christian Examiner.

SIR—I own myself the Baptist Elder who came by night (as your correspondent says,) to bro. Campbell, at Georgetown. There was a reason for my being a nocturnal visiter, perfectly satisfactory to the Bishop. The impression throughout the United States, produced by the publications and representations of that interview among the Reformers, is, that I refused a discussion with him from a fear that his arguments were too powerful to withstand. Now, to convince you, and the religious world, that this is a mistake,

I propose to Bishop Alexander Campbell, to meet him at any city on the Ohio River between Louisville and Cincinnati, or at either of those places, and publicly discuss with him the doctrine of the Remission of Sins in Baptism—Him and myself mutually agreeing on the time.

Between Elder Campbell and myself, there has always been friendly feelings, as gentlemen, although I dissent totally from his religious sentiments. JOHN BRYCE.

Georgetown, Ky. March 31, 1831.

I cannot accept the challenge of Mr. John Bryce, for the following reasons:

1. I have never yet consented to meet any gentleman in public or private discussion for the purpose of affording him an opportunity of exculpating himself from the charge of cowardice, which is the only reason assigned by Mr. Bryce for soliciting a public discussion. He issues the above challenge to prove that he is no coward: he has, then, gained his object, unless some virtuoso should allege that he knew full well that it would never be accepted.

2. In the second place, I cannot consent to contend with any man who writes English which I cannot parse; and I must confess that all the rules of the English syntax will not enable me to parse even the words of the challenge.

3. The utility of a public discussion depends much upon the confidence the people have in the parties who engage in it. My apprehensions in this case are, that the discomfiture of my friend Bryce would not satisfy his friends, for they would say they had a hundred men still, superior to him; and that the discussion would not be of sufficient interest to have it published by a disinterested person.

4. My views on that subject are already before the public in writing. They are now public property. If Mr. Bryce thinks he can prove them fallacious, let him do so by the press. We will then attend to him according to his merit.

But good as these reasons appear to me, provided the Opposition in Kentucky will select Mr. John Bryce, or any other person, to appear for them as the defender of their faith; and provided they will find a stenographer, of good character, impartial and capable, who will on his own account, and for his own benefit, give the discussion to the public, I will consent to meet him on some definite propositions including the points at issue. For Mr. Bryce, as a gentleman of good temper, and of very courteous demeanor, I entertain a very high opinion, and cannot but regret that the mould of doctrine into which his mind has been cast so eminently disqualifies him for the investigation of any question to be decided by the alone authority of the New Testament. EDITOR.

ANDREW BROADDUS AND THE EXTRA No. I.

Though not requested by Mr. Broaddus, I will afford him all the facility in my power, to find a market for his pamphlet. I will venture to predict that he will find more purchasers among the friends of reform than I can find readers among our opponents. ED.

NOTICE.

Will be put to press, in a few weeks—"The Extra Examined: A Reply to Mr. Campbell's M. Harbinger, Extra, on Remission of Sins," &c.—By A. Broaddus, of Caroline, Virginia.

As it is expected that the religious public—particularly the Baptists, and the friends of Baptist sentiments, in a wide extent of the country, will feel an interest in this subject, we respectfully request, on behalf of the cause of evangelical truth, that the Editor of 'The Christian Index,' Philadelphia—of 'The Baptist Chronicle,' Georgetown, Ky.—of 'The Western Baptist,' Rock Springs, Ill.—and of 'The Regular Baptist Miscellany, Zanesville, O.—would give this notice an insertion in their respective periodicals. Opportunity will thus be afforded to persons in different sections of the country, to send timely orders for a supply. The price of the pamphlet will probably not exceed 25 cents, and a reasonable discount will be allowed to those who may take them by the quantity. Terms to be more definitely made known when the work is put to press.

Orders should be addressed (post paid) to Elder Eli Ball, or to Mr. William Sands—City of Richmond, Va.

March, 1381.

EVANGELICAL INQUIRER.

THE "Christian Examiner," a very excellent Monthly Magazine, well deserving of a liberal patronage, edited by brother J. G. Norwood, Louisville, Ky. and devoted to primitive christianity, notices in the following words a prospectus issued by our able and intelligent brother D. S. Burnet, for a weekly paper to be issued in Cincinnati, Ohio. In the following notice of the subjoined proposals we cordially concur. ED.

BRO. DAVID S. BURNET, Editor of the "*Evangelical Inquirer,*" published at Dayton, Ohio, and a very able advocate of the ancient gospel and order of things, has issued proposals for publishing his work in a new and enlarged form, at Cincinnati. The Inquirer is one of the few papers in the United States which support a restitution of primitive christianity, and as such, it solicits and deserves the attention and patronage of all the friends of Reform. Its course, so far, has been bold, decided, energetic, and convincing. Above all, it is written in a christian spirit. We hope bro. Burnet will meet with sufficient encouragement to commence the publication immediately. A *weekly* paper advocating the *old gospel,* cannot but prove of great benefit to our cause. We subjoin the proposals. ED. C. EX.

PROPOSALS for publishing in Cincinnati, by David S. Burnet, a weekly paper, to be called, THE EVANGELICAL INQUIRER.—Every day the laboring press sends forth its thousand sheets, and still there are readers. Indeed it is now supposed that the liberty and intelligence of a community materially depend upon the free expression of opinion, and therefore the greater the increase of facilities of discussion the better. The liberty of the press can only be abused by restrictions. Unfettered it will correct itself. However, notwithstanding these considerations, a new work, presuming upon public patronage, should come with claims entitled to recommendation.

As this paper is to be a continuation of the Evangelical Inquirer (a periodical published in Dayton by the editor) in a new form, its objects will be twofold. First, the statement and defence of the christian religion and the development of the order of things established by Jesus Christ. Secondly, news and notices, moral, religious, and literary. Subordinate to these purposes there will be essays and dissertations upon all topics within the limitations of this prospectus; extracts and compendiums of ancient and modern, sacred and profane history; geographical sketches and literary pieces. The following is from the prospectus of the Inquirer, and may be considered the expose of the course of this work if published. "Sectarianism, for ages, has desolated the territory and disturbed the peaceful inhabitants of Messiah's realm. The kingdom of peace has become the seat of war, and the christian sects are the belligerent powers. All their operations are warlike, and their engines are directed against themselves. The righteous cause is bleeding at every pore. To make a system, which, pleading the authority of the Jewish or Christian scriptures, can effectually oppose or destroy all competition for orthodoxy or influence, has been, with few exceptions, the object of all the moderns, and the highest point to which their ambition aspired. No wonder they differed, and perhaps all differed from the oracles, in temper, faith and practice. The editor and his associates belong to the peace party. He aims at the destruction of bigotry and sectarian feeling, within the compass of his influence. He considers the right of opinion inviolable. In the absence of argument and fact, he is not disposed to resort to calumny and misrepresentation—the weapons of Antichrist. His pages will turn away from such, while they will receive the impression of well written pieces upon both sides of every admissible question. This work does not contemplate the reformation of any system, nor the revision for adoption of any *Creed.* Every thing is to be done by restoring the King to his honors, and his institutions to their places. Upon our banners will be inscribed *The restoration of the ancient order of things,* or

a complete failure of our purpose. Under this banner we will wield our pen, and around it we hope no worse forces will rally, than intrepidity and friendly feeling. The assistance of some experienced writers is promised.

J. S. Thompson, who recently renounced Universalism, gives the following *five* points as the essential doctrines of the system: "There is no Devil; There is no Hell; There will be no future Judgment; There is no religious distinction among men in this world, and there will be no difference in their condition in the world to come!"

MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE *MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.*

Wm E True, Newcastle, Ky. paid vol 1 for S Holloway and Thos Holloway—I W Wilks, Winchester Tenn. paid for G L Ipscomb and G Hockersmith—W Bruce, Bruceville Ind. pd vol 1 for R Lete—H Gore, Bardstown Ky. pd vol 1 for H Glasscock; vol 2 for S Carpenter, R Jones, and himself—D Doughton, Hubbard O. pd vol 1—J Cahoon, Dover O. pd vol 1 for G L Dinsmore and O Adams—I L Flemming, Lexington Ky. pd vol 1 for C Wade, vol 2 for I Williams and F R Palmer—W Bradshaw, New Orleans La. pd vol 1—N L Lindsey, North Middletown Ky. pd vol 1 for t B istow, T Parish, & J Covington—F Thompson, Mt. Alban Miss. pd vol 1 for W Thompson, W Bohanan, J B Stephens, L Evans, M Hackler, H Fulks. S F Chisolm, and R J Hayning—A Straith, Charlestown Va. pd vol 1—D Kellough, Bloomington Ia. vol 1 for G W Hardin, and vol 2 for himself—A Wilkinson, Skaneatlas N. Y. pd two copies vol 1 for W Anne Lathrope, also $1 for vol 2—J T Johnson, Georgetown Ky. pd vols 1 & 2—S Croxton, Tappahannock Va. pd vols 1 & 2 for Capt. I Dunn and W F Burnet—J B Allison, Carrol O. pd vol 1—F V Sutton, White Chimnies Va. pd vols 1 & 2 for K Hutcheson and Elizabeth Woolfolk; also vol 1 for J Woolfolk and B Coleman, and vol 2 for J C Sutton. T Grew, Barnesville O. pd vol 1—Walker Reid, Washington Ky. pd vols 1 and 2—J Bryant, Hopkinsville Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for L Harlan, and $1 for vol 2 for S Wilkinson—W Triplett, Flemingsburg Ky. pd vol 2 for J F L Reynolds, J D Early, T Porter, J Henderson, T Day, and himself—P B Pendleton, Stevensville Va. pd vols 1 & 2 for J C Ray, vol 2 for T Walker, G Spencer, and himself—T M Henley, Loyds Va. pd vol 1 for I Cox, R S Barker, and Wm Spindle—I W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store Va. pd vol 1 for W Doswell, and vol 2 for himself—W R Cole, Wilmington O. pd vol 1 for M R Chew and B Bason, vol 2 for G W McMannis and W Wilson, and vols 1 & 2 for A E Strickle—L Hobbs, Wellsburg Va. pd vols 1 & 2—N Zane, Esq. Wheeling Va. pd vol 1—J Barker, Maysville Ky. pd vol 2 for M Warner—D Hook, Louisville, Ga. pd vol 1 for himself and brother—S G Earle, Earle's Store S. C. pd vol 2 for J McPherson, E McPherson, J Hardy, and himself; also vol 1 for W Prothro—Wm Poston, Winchester Ky. pd vol 2 for H T Chevis and John Morton, Colbyville Ky.—W H Burges, Windham O. pd vols 1 & 2—I Foster, Bedford Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for R R King; and R English $1 for vol 1—J Prewett, Fayette Mo. pd vol 1 for T Fristoe, J Harvey, and Maj. Burton $1 for vol 1—T W Coleman, Oak Grove Ky. pd vol 2 for J H Robbins—T Spencer, Syracuse N. Y. pd vol 1, and $1 for vol 2—O Thomas, Roberts' Store Ky. pd vol 1 for I Drane, and vol 2 for E Chubbs—A Armstrong, Fort Wayne Ia. pd vols 1 & 2—E McGehee, pd vol 1 for A W Clopton, vol 2 for M W McCraw and Jas Schofield, Prince Edward Va.—J T Johnson, pd vols 1 & 2 for Joel Johnson, vol 2 for Wm Johnson,* and vols 1 & 2 for R J Ward—D F Newton, Fifes Va. pd vol 2 for W J Hall, and for Thomas Spurlock, Lynchburg Va.—J T Coburn, Warren O. pd vol 2.

Erratum—I G Bacon, Maysville, instead of L P Bacon, Nashville, as stated in No. 2.

* All official titles, except where the identification of a person requires it, are dispensed with in publishing Receipts.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{No. 5.} BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, MAY* 4, 1831. {Vol. II.}

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

LETTER FROM R. B. SEMPLE.

No. III.

DEAR SIR:

AFTER reading your caricatures of my letter, I deliberately read again the letter. I still own it. I find nothing to retract. It is about what I wish it to be.

I have no talent for satire. In this I willingly yield you the palm. When your satirical genius is exercised against error or folly, I have been occasionally amused by it; when against myself or friends, I feel it; but when put forth against vital truth, I am awfully impressed, and can only say, "*The Lord rebuke thee.*"

My letter contains these questions:

1st. What authority has any man to assert that any part of Holy Writ has ceased to be obligatory, unless Holy Writ itself declares it?

2dly. What part of the New Testament has declared that the whole of the Old Testament is abrogated except those texts that are quoted into the New?

I ask these questions, and say to you who made the assertion, *the onus probandi* lies upon you. You reply, "I do not, however, exactly approve of the proposition you have made for me." Indeed! You do not like to be called upon for proof of your own assertions. I assure you I do not wonder at this. You must feel it, at least you ought to feel it, an awful task to undertake to nullify any part of God's Word, without God's authority for it.

Your direct misquotation of my letter, and thereby making it to say what it does not say, has excited my indignation. This is a species of unfairness of which others forewarned me, but which I had hoped would not take place. The letter says, some parts of the Old Testament have been declared in the New as abrogated, and many others being obviously temporary, ceased to be obligatory, because every object has been accomplished for which they were originally given. This is also true of the New Testament. Then the letter quotes the case of the community of goods in the Apostolic day. In your quotation of my letter you omit that part which speaks of a part of the Old Testament being temporary, and stop at the word abroga-

ted, and then skip to the words "this is also true of the N. T." as if this expression was exclusively applicable to the word abrogated. Now to me it seems that the fair interpretation of the sentence should refer it to the clause immediately preceding, viz: "many others being obviously temporary ceased to be obligatory," &c. This I aver was the design of the expression. And can you, sir, deny that the example of Christ and his Apostles is obligatory upon christians unless nullified by other examples, or by circumstances? Why then call so loudly for a command? I assert without fear that this example would have been binding upon all christians to the end of time, if it had not been done away by a different course pursued among the Gentile Churches, and by which we understand that it was temporary, and designed only for that particular crisis.

Permit me to say, sir, that this comes with an ill grace from one who is so zealous to establish weekly communion solely by example, and that too, far from being clearly exhibited in the N. T.

Your criticisms upon the words abrogate, free and sovereign, &c. may go for what they are worth. I use words in their common acceptation, and if any choose to criticise upon them, they may do so. It gives me little concern.

I will now assign my reasons for the course which I have ursued in this business.

Many excellent essays have been written by my friends against your most obnoxious doctrine of baptismal regeneration and the denial of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. Much was said on the contrary by you and your friends, stating that you aggrandized the scriptures, that the word, the word was sufficient of itself, that the Spirit was in the word, &c. exhorting them to read the scriptures, and depend upon nothing else. The impression went abroad very extensively, that you were almost exclusively an advocate for the Bible. This I have known, or fully believed, for you was so far from being correct, that instead of it you had done as much towards weakening the authority of the Bible as you had to invalidate the doctrine of Spiritual Regeneration. No attempt having been made, within my knowledge, to correct this most deadly course, I am forward to invite attention to the subject. Here I think is a fair statement of the case.

First. By one fell swoop you aim to destroy the whole of the Old Testament. N. B. Take notice I say the Old Testament, the book called the Old Testament, not the Levitical law acknowledgedly abrogated, not the writings of Moses alone as you would hold out. I speak of God's Word, as written, from Genesis to Malachi: every word of it—nay, every iota not declared in the New Testament to be abrogated. These you deny have any obligation upon christians farther than they are quoted into the New Testament. These you compare to old British laws in Virginia. This is your undenied and undeniable assertion, and 'tis this I called upon you to prove, and insisted that the *onus probandi* lay upon you, but which you say is a proposition you do not entirely approve.

Secondly. But many say, we have the New Testament in all its clearness and force. No, indeed. By your continual resort to translations, and that too upon very important and vital doctrines, you have greatly weakened the force of the New Testament; i. e. so far as your principles have prevailed. If you are told of this, and the other texts plainly maintaining the doctrine of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, you say it may be translated a holy spirit in man, meaning nothing more than a holy temper of mind. If it is argued that Christ specially calls and has promised to sustain his ministers to the end of the world, you reply, that that promise had reference only to the immediate Apostles of Christ, and the term the end of the world should not be translated or understood as the end of the world, but the end of that generation. Many such things have I seen and heard from you. These few I give as specimens. Now to me it seems certain that this tends greatly to weaken the authority of the New Testament, especially with unlearned readers. They will ask, And what part must we take for God's word? We cannot read the original. Our old and generally acknowledged English Testament is a mistranslation. If God's Word, owned and acknowledged as such for centuries, be thus taken from us, what shall we do? You may say, Here is my New Testament, compiled from very learned men. But christians will say, But were they inspired men? If one set of learned men would make translations materially wrong, what security have we for any others? That the original is the true word of God is certain; but that our established translation varies materially from the original, is denied, most positively denied, by learned men of most of the christian denominations. Any attempts, therefore, to make material changes in our established translation, tends to weaken the authority of God's word.

Thirdly. But this is not all. In your Christian Baptist of July, 1830, p. 276, you say: "I will say nothing about the order of things in the families of those who have been worshipping God in worshipping a preacher, or sitting once a month under the allegories and comments of a person who five times in seven cannot tell the nominative case to a verb, or the antecedent to a relative. I never did disdain, nor did I ever cast a disdainful look upon a brother because he was illiterate—nay, so far from it I have generally encouraged them to improve their gifts. But I cannot compliment any man for assuming the office of an interpreter or expositor of scripture. Men may proclaim Jesus, and exhibit the reasons why they believe on him. They may preach Christ successfully without English, Latin, or Greek, just in the language of the nursery; but to hear such a man expounding texts, or explaining scripture, is a burlesque on the pulpit and a satire upon the age."

This, my dear sir, crowns the climax. A man may proclaim Jesus, and give reasons why he believes on him, but unless he is learned he must not expound texts, or explain scripture. And whence must he draw his reasons for believing? Not from the scriptures, because these he cannot explain, you will say, from the nursery. His

mother taught him, and therefore in the language of the nursery he may proclaim Jesus, and give his reasons for believing him. If you would dash me against a rock by making me say what I never said, I think you have here dashed yourself against a stone by which you ought to be ground to powder. Is it not self-evident that most men can explain what they understand? Some men, for the want of utterance, cannot bring out clearly what they understand; but this applies to the learned as well as to the illiterate. If, then, an unlearned man cannot explain scripture, he cannot understand it, and of course it is needless to read it. So, then, the good old Protestant doctrine that the Bible is a plain, easy book, and that every man should read it, is exploded. None but scholars can expound texts, or explain scripture. Is it not undeniably plain, that a man who has the gift of utterance can explain what he understands? Take an example—take, for instance, the elder C ——. He knows nothing of Latin, or Greek, nor of English grammar, unless he has learned it within a few years—no, not even the nominative case to a verb. He, however, used to be exceedingly flippant, and never failed to explain any thing he understood, whether temporal or spiritual, political or religious. He has put many a Greek scholar into the back ground in explaining the scriptures. He is said to be a disciple of the new school. How will he act when you are present? Will he abstain from being an interpreter or expositor of the scripture for fear you should give him a disdainful look? I think not. His vanity would forbid it, if his conscience did not. Many more of your disciples, who are preachers, are equally unlearned. How do they relish this decree? They may say, indeed, must none of us expound a text, or explain our Bible? I know one who used to be my friend and favorite brother, before he became a Campbellite. He knows nothing of Greek, or Latin, or English grammar, but I used to think him quite a good expositor of texts. Before the seeds of discord were sown among us, he, with some half dozen others, formed a circle in which expounding texts was our almost sole employment. We could often say, did not our hearts burn within us. All this must now be done away.

To sum up the whole, sir, your denial of the authority of the Old Testament; your frequently avoiding the plain meaning of the New Testament, by resorting to new translations; and last, though not least, your assertion that none but learned men can expound texts, or explain scripture, justify me in repeating that you have done much, very much, towards weakening the authority of the Bible.

Your attempts to make my letter appear contradictory, only prove your talent for things of that sort. Turn the same talent against the scripture, and you may be successful, as will appear from reading Gibbon, Voltaire, Hume, Tom Paine, &c.

Your misrepresentation of my views by so repeatedly holding out that I inculcated that we are as much bound to obey Moses as Christ, the law as the gospel, is really vexatious. I am tempted to think that it is designed to draw off the reader from the real subject, lest the deformity of your own system should be seen. When I speak of

some parts of the Old Testament being abrogated, it was not necessary to tell the candid reader that this pointed to the ceremonial law, which all of us admit is abrogated. Yet you speak of Moses and obeying Moses so repeatedly, that it is plain that you wish to hold out the idea that you only deny the obligation of the ceremonial law, while I maintain its obligation. This *you* know is not the case. I must, however, tell your readers that it is the unabrogated parts of the Old Testament which I maintain are still in full force. It is not that law which waxes old and is ready to vanish away, but that law which shall stand when the heavens and the earth shall pass away. It is not that law which can be shaken, but which remaineth and cannot be shaken. It is not that law of which Christ is the end, but that law, and those prophets, which he came not to destroy but to fulfil. It is that law which is not made void by faith, but established. This law and this testimony is what I contend for, and what I believe still constitute an essential part of God's word to christians. I will come to a close by a question or two:

In the spirit of friendship, permit me to inquire if you have not somewhere denied that John's baptism was christian baptism? and of course that John's baptism is not now in force? Have you not also said it is not now proper to pray in the words of the Lord's prayer, "thy kingdom come"? It is my impression that these things are to be found in your writings. I have not all your books; but if I am correct, then I have the authority of Mr. Campbell that some parts of the New Testament are abrogated.

My own opinion is, that the imposition of hands upon baptized believers, the anointing the sick with oil as a religious rite, the washing the saints' feet, &c. are of the nature of abrogated ceremonies, very significant in their spiritual intention, (as are many of the Levitical ceremonies,) but not to be literally practised after the Apostolic age.

Finally, sir, in a matter which rests upon fair argument, I will request you in your next to have fewer witticisms and criticisms, and more of sound reasoning. Paul reasoned out of the scriptures, (the Old Testament.) "Direct me to a quip or merry turn in all he ever wrote, and I grant you take it for your text."

Very respectfully, your friend and most obed't.

RO. B. SEMPLE.

LETTER TO R. B. SEMPLE.—*No. IV.*

DEAR SIR:

THE preceding communication from you will not, because I think it cannot, fail to convince the most prepossessed of your admirers how much you are indebted to their prejudices and partialities for the quantum of influence you have obtained over them. A few such epistles and the authority of your opinions is gone forever. Some of the more discriminating begin to say that your writings against the Reformation, and your protest against some of its leading principles, are among the most fortunate incidents in its history. What your "protest" lacked in argument to sustain it, has been amply compen-

sated by the passion and feeling exhibited in your last. Your authority with the people, my good sir, depended much upon the goodness of your disposition, and your concurrence in opinion with other men supposed to be great as well as good. To hazard, then, your right to the reputation which is justly due you for natural goodness, christian suavity and courteousness of temper, is as impolitic as it is unreasonable for you to assume the *rights of Michael* to rebuke Satan.

Where, my dear sir, is that christian spirit of which you have so often spoke? Your "indignation" certainly has got the better of your good temper, to say nothing of your judgment! else why could you assume to yourself the rights of Michael; and greater rights than Michael assumed?—for it was when Satan *personally* disputed with him about the body of Moses that he said to Satan, "The Lord rebuke thee." Are you authorized to say to every disciple who dissents from your opinions, and who gives his reasons for his dissent, as much as you dare say to Satan were you as high in authority as Michael! But perhaps you quoted these words, as the fashion is, without any regard to their meaning or connexion, because they suited your holy indignation against my treating your letter according to its literal import.

Were I now to reply to your letter before me as it deserves, you would never write me another. But although I have as good a right to talk of your "errors;" nay, to call your opposition to reform "opposition to vital truths," as you have thus to denominate any opinion or saying of mine, I choose rather to entreat than to denounce, and to expostulate than convict you of either imbecility or unfairness. I make no defence of myself against the charge of unfairness in replying to your letter published in the January No. I have not said a single word amiss of it, nor misquoted it in any one instance. The reader has only to turn back and read your letter and my reply. If I have done you injustice in any one instance, I know it not. Besides, I could not easily give a wrong coloring to any thing you have written, as I published your letter in full. You charge me with "caricaturing" and "misquoting" your letter: have I not published it *fairly* and fully? Let it be read, and my remarks upon it—then I have nothing to fear from your imputations.

But let me tell you, my dear sir, that you are very imperfectly acquainted with what I have written on these subjects. You appear never to have read, only in a desultory way, a single volume of the Christian Baptist, or even the 1st vol. of this work. I know that no person of your understanding could make such assertions and representations if he were acquainted with half the essays we have written, unless he were determined to misrepresent, which I cannot impute to you. Your letter before me is full of the most gross and palpable misrepresentations, of which you are incapable if you had read with any attention. The Columbian College, and your congregations and numerous avocations, have so completely engrossed your whole time as to leave not an hour for calm and patient enquiry into the truth of these matters. How else could you assert—"that by one fell swoop you (I) aim to destroy every thing written from Genesis to Malachi?"

I will not remind you of "railing accusations," nor of Michael's address to Satan; but, sir, no man has ever uttered a greater slander than you have expressed in the above words.

Your remarks upon translations are all anticipated in my last reply to you; or rather you have done no more than to reiterate a few of the most common sayings of the most illiterate pleaders for what King James said and commanded. This deserves no notice from me at this time.

Your quotation from vol. 7, p. 276 of the Christian Baptist, which you say "crowns the climax," I am proud to see in your epistle. And your sermon on that text is well intended to enlist in your favor all the no-grammarian preachers, the spiritual men of the new commission, who have been specially called and sent by the dispensation of some new spirit. But, sir, I would not erase one word of it. It is as plain as the light of the sun that no man can be the interpreter of a language which he does not understand. And I know of no person who was ever regarded as a commentator, who was not grammatically acquainted with the construction of a sentence. The plea for special illumination, among the Methodists and Baptists, has been urged in lieu of a literary education; and by suggestions or internal illuminations, some of their preachers have pretended to open "the mysteries of religion," as they are accustomed to denominate them. To understand the meaning of a plain sentence, or to illustrate to the apprehension of others a large portion of the New Testament narratives and sayings, is quite possible to those who are well read in the book itself, without either classical, or even the most common grammatical attainments; but to presume to act the critic without the knowledge of the ordinary rules of construction, contained in the elementary grammars of our mother tongue, will ever appear ridiculous in the eyes of all men of reflection. And no man who is not immersed into some new spirit will pretend to expound or interpret a sentence, the literal and grammatical import of the words of which he does not understand.

To preach the gospel, to repeat the gospel facts and to exhort men to obey the gospel, to reform, and turn to God, may be effectually done in numerous instances, even by those who cannot read. It is not long since the Baptists had some preachers who could not read a chapter in the book; and for aught I know, it is probable they may still have some of this class. To such proclaimers of reformation I have nothing to say, provided they modestly assume not to sermonize or offer criticisms or comments upon what they cannot read.

The most illiterate men whom our Heavenly Father employed to speak his will to men, were qualified to speak and write grammatically: for to speak or write otherwise is to write and speak unintelligibly.

But, sir, many of our grammarians, and some of our classical commentators, are just as ill-qualified to interpret or prophesy as the most illiterate; for they are imbued with a mystic spirit, and baptized into spiritual meanings and double senses. It is with many of them a sign of unregeneracy to regard the literal meaning as of any im-

portance in understanding the Divine Communications, though made in human language. Historic faith, and the literal meaning of the text, is with them no better than the faith of demons. To affirm that God means what he says, and says what he means, in the usual acceptation of words, is blasphemy against their doctrine of spiritual meanings and mystical faith. Hence their philological attainments are as useless to them as mathematics to a poet, or the science of mechanics to a metaphysician. To suppose that the proclamation of mercy from the Great King is to be interpreted by the same rules which are applied to a proclamation from the President of these States, is in their judgment a profanation of sacred things. Of what use, then, are the rules of construction, or the literal meaning of words, to the person who relies upon an internal spiritual operation, which is supposed to unveil the secrets of the written Oracle, and to communicate the spiritual meaning of religious hieroglyphics? Hence it is that we hesitate not to place in the same class the most illiterate proclaimer and the most accomplished scholar who believes in a revelation upon a revelation. I cannot contemplate the latter as a better commentator than the former. I am bold to avow my conviction, that of all the plagues under which christendom has been afflicted for "a time, and times, and the dividing of a time;" for the last twelve hundred and sixty years, the greatest has been the Egyptian mythological rules of interpretation, in the hands or heads of the "christian priesthood." God has given them over to an *undiscerning* mind. The majority have believed a lie. There is not a fountain in the land into which these spiritual frogs have not found their way. My best wish for you, my dear sir, is that you could find the celebrated waters of Lethe, and drink until you forget all that you have learned from these dreaming doctors.

You would have known the meaning of the passage you quoted from the Christian Baptist, and given a much more favorable view of it, had you read that work with the attention you have bestowed on more ordinary matters. How comes it that none of those persons whom you would provoke by your insinuations, has ever inferred from those remarks what you have done!! But, perhaps, they never supposed themselves implicated. And although the persons to whom you allude are highly gifted and more able proclaimers, and, indeed, more eloquent speakers, than most of our most finished scholars, yet their strength lies not in expositions nor criticisms, which I presume their modesty forbids them to attempt; and certainly I never heard them attempt the things which are reprobated in those remarks. They have too much good sense and acquaintance with men and things to assume the philologist, or the office of linguists and grammarians. It is the smatterers in language and science which are ever and anon showing how profound they are, who assume the office of expositors without having that acquaintance with language, or the sacred scriptures, necessary to the work of an expositor.

Men, you say, who cannot expound, cannot understand. This is as true as the converse; men who can understand can expound. And

do you, sir, think that men unacquainted with language can expound any sentence the construction and words of which they do not understand. How far the most illiterate may understand the sayings of the Apostles, I presume not to decide. I know the gospel history is so plain that whosoever runs may read; but I am far from supposing that all who apprehend and believe the gospel can be expositors of the New Testament: and in saying this, I only repeat what has been said by all who have spoken or written upon this subject, and that which daily observation and experience sustain. And I feel assured that you, although you find it convenient at this time to express surprise at the above quotation, would be the last man, as the advocate of the Columbian College, to license every man who believes in Jesus to become what you call a teacher of the christian religion. Give me leave to add, that I would have as strong objections to those you would license from your theological schools, as you would have to license every male who has been immersed into the faith. But to come to a close on this subject, whenever you are disposed to show that every man who can understand any book written in English, is able critically and philologically to teach not only that book, but the subject or science on which it treats, then will I show that every man who believes the gospel can teach the christian religion, and that the knowledge of grammar and of language is unnecessary to the understanding of any thing expressed in human speech.

Your language, my dear sir, on the subject of "the authority of the Old Testament," and "the abrogation of some parts of the New," I presume is so incorrect that it fails to communicate your own ideas. When you attempt to explain yourself, it would appear that after all you agree with me that we are not under Moses, but under Christ. This is all I mean, as it is all I ever did contend for. I do not care how much you extol the divine mission of Moses, nor the authority of the Jewish prophets, so long as you maintain with Paul and me that we are not under the law, but under favor; that Christ is our only prophet, priest, and king. I make more use of the Old Testament in my family, and in my public addresses, than any Baptist I know. Scarcely a day passes in which I do not read, either in the morning or in the evening, one section of the Jewish scriptures; and very frequently both my morning and evening readings in my family are from the Jewish scriptures. Many of my illustrations, arguments, and analogies, in my public discourses, are drawn from the law and the prophets. I go farther, and say, that no man can as fully understand the New Testament, or as firmly believe in the mission of Jesus, as he who is well versed in those ancient writings. I question very much indeed, friend Semple, whether you, who *talk* so much about the law and the prophets, regard them as highly as I do: and I am willing even to appeal to yourself, whether you can say that you have daily, when at home, read them in your family for the last year. I frequently lecture on the prophets and the law in my family readings to my household, and draw from them arguments and exhortations to enforce the piety and morality which a greater personage than Moses

or Solomon has inculcated upon us. But I do not judaize. I do not use the law unlawfully. The whole community who hear me speak know how highly I appreciate these writings.

Let me tell you in the close of this epistle, as I have something more to say to you hereafter, that you are too superficially acquainted with the cause I plead, too remiss in your reading, and too rash in forming conclusions, to have ever written a line for the press except as an enquirer. Your system I profess to understand. Of its impotency you are now a monument. It can never rise higher than its fountain. You are opposing "vital truths." You are opposing vital truths in opposing this reformation.

The restoration of God's son to his honors on earth, and his Apostles to the thrones he gave them, is that for which we plead, and that which you oppose in opposing the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things. In doing this I think you do it ignorantly, and more through prejudice than through any perversity of determination. Therefore I wish to exhibit to you all long-suffering and forbearance. It would give me and many of your *real* friends much pleasure to see you surrender yourself wholly to the authority of the great prophet and lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy. You would not then lean on Egypt, nor trust in Idumea. You would then spread forth your branches like the palm tree, and your fragrance would be as Lebanon and as Sharon. I need not tell you that the monitor is usually more faithful than the panegyrist, though seldom or ever so acceptable.

I would entreat you, my dear sir, to examine your late proceedings, and to ascertain whether unfeigned allegiance to the Great King, or any other consideration, may have dictated a course so incompatible with yourself, and so similar to that which you denounced in others when defending the Baptists from the tyranny of those evangelical sects for whose communion you now have more longings than for the fellowship of those who honor the Lord by keeping all his commandments. You may yet expect to hear from me on the lawful use of the law. Till then, please examine in vol. 1, No. 2, my essay on the Judaizers, No. I.

Your friend, THE EDITOR.

MARRIAGE—*No. II.*

Mr. Editor,

YOU cannot conceive how much I have heard about my first Essay on Marriage. One said, "It is a cunning piece;" "I dont believe in it," said another; and a third, "I think the Editor is on our side by the questions which he asks." Another asked, "Whether the Old World was not destroyed in consequence of intermarriages between good and bad people?" Again one would say, "Were not the Jews prohibited from marrying with Gentiles?" and "Look at Solomon!" "See the whole nation at the return from Babylon! were they not, without exception, ordered to repudiate their heathen wives? and

some who had originally wedded unbelieving women themselves, as they would *now* call them, thought it altogether insufferable to call marriage a political institution." But only one did I hear ask, "What is the law of Christ on the subject?" and none did I find willing to make the Jews their patterns in this point—viz. putting away the unbelieving party.

Some would thrust the man who would dare to marry an unbaptized woman out of the church; but this did not the Jews. They had law on this matter, and acted accordingly, commanding the offender immediately to put away the infidel. Those people would punish a man as much for bringing such a person into his own family as if he had brought her into their church, indiscriminately supposing that a family is as much a religious institution as the church of Christ is; but marriage makes a man and woman only one flesh. Alack-a-day! too seldom, one spirit!

No Jew would have been retained in the congregation for saying he repented of his unlawful marriage; nor would he have been taken in again for any reason short of putting his wife away. Let us be consistent, then, and if we are to follow Jewish example without respect to the law of Christ, let us follow it closely. Let those who married unbelieving wives put them away, and then they themselves may be retained in the congregation.

The fact is, that before the flood the ancestors of the Messiah were called "the seed of the woman" and "the sons of God," while Cain's people were styled "the children of men." After the flood Messiah's family were finally styled "Jews," and those who had departed from the true God, "Gentiles." It seems to have been the intention of our Heavenly Father that his son Jesus should have a godly ancestry from the beginning of the world, and to honor godliness by bringing forth his Son from among those families which practised it from the beginning of time. This great purpose for which such political separation was introduced, has now been attained. Messiah has come. "In the fulness of time God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," &c. "Faith being come, then, we have no more need of the schoolmaster."

Are we, then, to marry unbelievers? The Messiah has not said so. Many things are lawful which are not expedient. The brother who does so is to be pitied, perhaps; but not put out. The Apostle knew it to be lawful for him and for every disciple to eat what meats pleased them; but on many occasions he found it inexpedient to exercise this liberty. This great man entertained the highest reverence for the consciences of his weak brethren: there was no putting out by him, unless for right down wickedness. What a pretty figure we should make if we should excommunicate a brother for marrying the woman he loves now-a-days, and declare that we would not receive him again until he said, "I am sorry for what I have done!" thus putting out for love, and taking him in for aversion to his own flesh! What could such a person mean when he said "I am sorry?"—That he now disliked his wife? He could not be sorry for breaking Christ's law, for

we know that there is no law on the subject; and hence we cannot with propriety ask whether marriage with a believer or an unbeliever is lawful or unlawful, there being no law. We can only ask, Is it expedient or inexpedient? I should answer here, that it was sometimes expedient and sometimes inexpedient.

But one objects that the person who marries an unbeliever cannot attend to the manners and customs of our kingdom. "How," says such a one, "can I salute with a kiss the wife of a man who may have the strongest abhorrence for the custom?" It may be inexpedient; for as a person may unfit himself by things inexpedient for the Bishop's office, so a person may, by an inexpedient marriage, be unfitted for some of the noblest customs in our kingdom. I have known the finest disposition for hospitality broken to pieces by the avarice of the unbelieving party. But, mark me, I have seen this in the believing party too.

Upon the whole, christianity proposes to restore the holy ordinance of marriage to the footing on which it stood at the beginning—viz. that one man should have one wife. The Saviour observes to the Jews who practised polygamy, that it was not so from the *beginning;* and when the relation is formed, then we are instructed how to honor it: the husband is to love his wife, and the wife obey the husband, and to behave herself, that, if he is an unbeliever, he may be won without the word, by her chaste and comely behavior.

To the Editor's two first questions I respectfully answer, Yes! that "marriage is that institution which makes the parties one and places them on such an equality as no other relation, natural or political, recognizes; and ought therefore to be distinguished from other political relations." 2d. That "it is the origin of all natural relations in the human family, and does deserve, from its vast importance, to be noticed by the Great Lawgiver, and excepted out of the rank of relations which only spring from it." But however distinguished above other political relations, and however much excepted out of them, we cannot, by any distinction or exception, change the nature of a thing, and make spiritual that which is natural. God alone can do this; and if he had said that disciples should intermarry among themselves only, then it would have been done.

'But, brother *Parthenos*,' says one, 'pray whom did you marry?' What is that to thee, brother? Follow thou the things that are lovely, and expedient, and excellent, and then thou shalt have praise of the same. I married a daughter of our Heavenly Father, and God forbid that I should despise the Most High's family, and go from home to seek a wife among the families of the flesh. "Evil communications corrupt good manners," and it is the will of God that we should raise for him a godly seed, bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

'Why, brother Parthenos, you just practise what I preach,' says another. Yes, and you preach what you did not practise; but neither your preaching nor my practice is equal to the law of the Son of God. What say the Scriptures?

But I had almost forgot the Editor's third question:—

3. "Does not Paul, in saying he had a right to lead about a sister wife, imply that he had no right to lead about a wife that was not a sister?" The passage reads thus, Cor. ix. 2. "Have we not a right to eat and to drink? Have we not a right to lead about a sister wife as the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or have I only and Barnabas not a right to forbear working? The matter in question here is his ministerial support; and if any thing is implied at all, it is that he and his sister wife, if he had had one, were entitled to support. Paul was an Apostle, and there was no law by Christ saying that he should work or that he should not work; he acted in this matter as expediency demanded. There was no law by Christ saying that he should eat or not eat certain things; he acted in this expediently. There was no law by the Messiah commanding him to marry or to remain single; he acted expediently. And we may be assured that if the Apostle had wished to marry, that in regard to the object of his choice, he would have acted expediently, seeing there was no law on this point neither. When the Apostle said the bishop must be the husband of one wife, did he imply that other disciples might have two? Some might say that this was fairly implied, and I confess it looks like it; yet nothing is more certainly false. This only shows that it will always be dangerous to act upon implications as if they were verbal laws. But now to the Editor's last query:—

"Are not widows commanded by the Apostle to marry whom they please, only in the Lord; and why should widows more than virgins be restricted in these matters?" The Apostle says, "Concerning virgins I have no commandment from the Lord." This is enough for the young or for such as have never been married, viz. that there is no special law in regard to them apart from the law which regarded the whole community, viz. that all were permitted to "marry rather than burn." Why the Apostle circumscribed the liberty of widows will be settled when we have agreed that he has really done so. But I think many take for granted here, that which they ought to prove, viz. that the phrase "only in the Lord," means *only a man who is a christian.* The phrase "*in the Lord*" is of very frequent occurrence in the Scriptures: "Salute Persis who labored much in the Lord." "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." "They abode speaking boldly in the Lord." Now do these not mean that the persons themselves labored, died, and spoke, being in the faith of the Lord? And may "marrying only in the Lord" not mean that the person herself may marry, only in the faith of the Lord, *i. e.* not go out of him or become an idolater to get a husband. Again, it is said, "Let him that glorieth, glory in the Lord;" "nor the woman without the man in the Lord." Here the phrases are simply an acknowledgment of Christ's supremacy or headship. To "marry only in the Lord," may therefore mean to marry without giving up or abandoning the supremacy and headship of Christ as the only Mediator.—Again, "Your labor is not in vain in the Lord;" "be strong in the Lord;" "stand fast in the Lord," "both in the flesh and in the Lord;"

"wives, submit to your own husbands in the Lord." Here the phrases mean christianity—dear to you both in the flesh and in the Lord; that is, both as a natural relation and as a christian. To "marry only in the Lord," then, may mean that whether she married or not, or whomsoever she did marry, she herself must abide a christian. But if the law of Christ to widows, is, that they shall marry only a christian, then I say there is no remedy for those who have acted differently, but immediately to leave their husbands, unless we can suppose that the law of the state is above the law of Christ. If Christ's law says she shall not have a husband that is not a disciple, shall the law of man speak otherwise, and say she shall have and keep an unbelieving husband?

But the truth is that this whole chapter is written not about the persons to whom the Corinthians were to be married, but about marrying itself; and as the Apostle wished them to be without "anxious care," he told both the unmarried men and widows that it was good for them to remain like him, unmarried; and therefore I rather conceive the whole passage ought to be read thus: "If her husband be dead she is at liberty to be married to whom she pleases. Only *in the Lord* is she indeed happier if she so abides according to my opinion." That is my opinion expressed in the former part of the chapter, viz. that widows would be happier if they remained single like me.

I now appeal to the Editor whether this is not the literal reading of the Greek text, and whether our present translations are not most unnatural and forced readings of these Scriptures. To "marry only in the Lord," is therefore not a scriptural phrase. It is formed by putting the last words of one verse to the first words of another verse; or rather the phrase is half our own; or rather it is all our own together. The Apostle did not wish the disciples to marry at all, but to remain single that they might enjoy their religion without family care; and to be wholly happy in the Lord was to remain single; for such had nothing to care for but the things of the Lord. To "rejoice in the Lord," to "boast in the Lord," "labor in the Lord," and so forth, are intelligible expressions; but "to marry in the Lord" is to me unmeaning. We may as well speak of children in the Lord, or of hiring a servant in the Lord, or of having a master in the Lord, instead according to the flesh. But we have no masters in the Lord, no servants in the Lord, no children in the Lord, no wives nor husbands in the Lord; therefore I object both to the *phrase* and to the present English *version;* and I beg the Editor will do every thing to clear up this matter, that I may not be found wresting the Scriptures nor handling them deceitfully; for I fear the name of the Lord our God: to whom be glory. Amen! PARTHENOS.

REMARKS ON PARTHENOS.

AGAINST the views exhibited by Parthenos in the preceding Essay, and in his first number on this subject, it will be difficult to contend. The questions proposed by myself were designed to meet

the objections of others, which we had heard urged against the ground taken in the first essay. It is clear to my mind that we have no law concerning the persons with whom political relations are to be formed, no law saying with whom we may marry, or with whom we may not: yet I conceive it to be manifestly the tendency of christianity to lead the initiated to form all the intimate relations of life, as far as possible, with those who fear and love the Lord. But where the Great King has not legislated, no tribunal, no individual, has a right to legislate; and certainly no christian congregation can, consistently with their protessed subjection to Jesus Christ, exclude a person simply for marrying any person not forbidden by the laws of the land. And if they should put away any person from the congregation on that account alone, they can never restore him or her to their fellowship unless a divorce, virtual or formal, be obtained; for reformation in this case would be a separation from the unbelieving party, as also says the Jewish institution.

There are some things which, to a comprehensive mind, and much more to that all-comprehending mind which originated this institution, would appear inexpedient to legislate upon, and inexpressibly more advantageous to leave to the decisions of experience, and the tendencies of things. He or she that marries without regard to the spirit, the genius, and tendency of christianity, will generally have enough to endure without the superaddition of exclusion from christian society. Parents and seniors should teach the juniors the expediency of forming not only the marriage relation, but, as far as possible, all the more intimate political relations, with those who acknowledge and honor the same Lord and Saviour. Commercial intercourse, the employment of the various tradesmen, the hiring and employing servants, and all other political intimacies, christianity arranges not by law. Yet it is its tendency to induce christians to prefer to trade with christians, and to transact, as far as possible, all the business of life with the household of faith. How happy is the man who has a sister wife and christian servants; who walks in the shoes which a christian made, or who rides on a horse which a christian shod; whose body is covered with the cloth which a christian wove, and the garments which a christian made! If a christian plough his field, build his house, or perform for him any service, he feels himself happy in the assurance that it will all be done as if it was done for Jesus Christ. I will not say that he is happy who has these things done by men *professing* christianity, but by men *practising* it.

We only intended here to say that some important matters christianity leaves to be inferred, and peremptorily decides not. Marriage, as respects the parties who may enter into it, is among these. Every man who reasons well will choose, if he have the power of choosing, a sister wife; but all that Parthenos seems to desire to establish, and which he appears to have established, is, that he who can reason well and infer that he himself ought to marry a disciple, should not make his own inference a law for his brother who cannot reason as well as himself, and condemn him to exclusion because he either had not the

choice of a companion, or if he had, gratified his eye or his fancy more than his christian taste and feelings in the Lord.

With regard to the criticisms offered by Parthenos on the phrase "only in the Lord," we have to observe, that we are sensible of the singularity of the style, if we couple that phrase with the verb *marry*. As the punctuation is wholly human, we are at liberty to examine and re-examine the propriety of it. Although we have long felt the difficulty of understanding this phrase if connected with the verb *marry*, we have not examined, till since we read the above essay, whether the canons of the Greek language, or the laws of punctuation, or the usage of the Apostle, will permit such a punctuation as that which Parthenos has suggested. That the common reader may feel the importance of so slight a variation as the insertion of a point, or the transposing of one, we shall give a few instances of passages having the word *only* in them, and similarly constructed—Gal. 1. 23. "And I was personally unknown to the congregations of Judea which are in Christ only. But they heard that he who had persecuted them," &c. This is exactly according to the arrangement of the word *only* in the original. But the placing the point before only gives quite a different turn to it: then it reads—"But only they heard of me," &c. Gal. 2. 10. affords a similar instance—"That we should go to the Gentiles, but they to the circumcision only. Desiring that we should remember the poor." Only desiring that we should remember the poor. A third instance we shall give from the same writer—Philip 1. 27. "May abound through my coming to you again only. Behave worthy of the glad tidings." Only behave worthy of the glad tidings. She may marry whom she pleases, only in the Lord; or, only in the Lord she is happier if she remain unmarried. From these instances, an English reader may judge of the importance of transposing the point in passages if not exactly similar, so similar as to make them quite analogous. I would not, however, rely upon any change in the punctuation here, as it may be questionable which of the two is more in accordance with Paul's style, and with the genius of the language, were it not for the scope of the passage; and as the question was not concerning the persons with whom marriage might be formed, but concerning the expediency of the thing itself, in that crisis, it is more in accordance with that object, and the text will bear it, to point it as Parthenos has done.

Should any person holding different views on this subject wish to lay them before our readers, our pages are open to them. Much more may be added to enforce the necessity of making no bye-laws, or human arrangements, regulating matters which have not been settled by some positive enactment of the Great King. In this way all the platforms of church government were originated; and so soon as we make our inferences rules of practice for others, we begin to judge as the sectaries do, and to condemn men because they think differently, or have weaker heads than we suppose a kinder fate has bestowed on us: for he that condemns a person for a wrong inference, condemns his intellect, and censures him for being intellectually inferior to himself. EDITOR.

NEW NOMENCLATURE -ADAPTED TO NEW DIVINITY.

No. I.

IN reading the first page of the "Christian Index" for March 5, a small part of which is an extract from a pious Student in Yale, and the remainder from the Editor, I was forcibly struck with the deception that is practised, imperceptibly, perhaps, upon the writer and the reader, by newly coined religious phrases, and by the appropriation of biblical words and phrases in a sense unknown to the sacred penmen.

Presuming that it may be useful to our readers, we may occasionally furnish them with a few specimens of the new style which has been substituted for the sacred style—

1. "Pious Student." Is he a Jew, a Mussulman, or a Christian? Virgil's hero is generally called "the pious Eneas;" and as the Roman schools were filled with pious students, we should like to hear another name, designating what sort of piety this student possesses—whether Grecian, Roman, Jewish, Mahometan, or Christian piety—then we shall know whether he is what the first christians would have called "a disciple," or "a christian."

2. "Religious Revival." Is it what is usually called a "revival of religion"? or is it a revival of a religious *nature?* A revival of literature is barely intelligible, but a literary revival is something too metaphysical for us to understand.

3. "A state of engagedness." This religious revival has issued in a "state of engagedness." This is a new state.—Query. Is it a state of nature, or a state of grace? Is it justification, sanctification, or adoption?—Engagedness in Yale may mean attention. If so, a state of attention is an attentive state! Physicians have had to invent new names for the new improvements in disease. The typhoid and varioloid were unknown in the days of "primitive physic." The small pox, and the kine pox, have been known for some time. The varioloid is a recent disease—and perhaps this "state of engagedness" may be a sort of religious varioloid.

4. "Eight or ten (pious students) profess to be regenerated." That is, I presume, *say* they are regenerated. To "profess to be regenerated" indicates that regeneration is an affection of the mind similar to repentance, sorrow, or joy. I never read in the New Testament, or in any ancient writing, of any one who "professed to be regenerated." To profess to be circumcised, is barely tolerable; but to profess to be born again, is as absurd a phrase as for a child to profess to be born.

5. "Many more manifest a deep contrition for sin, and are inquiring the way of salvation." From whom do they inquire? I did not know that many of the students of Yale had been educated in a pagan land, where they never had read the Acts of the Apostles. I think the Bible Society ought to furnish Yale College with a few copies of the Acts of the Apostles.

6. "We need not the art of prophecy." I have heard something of

the "fine arts," and something of the "useful arts," the "arts and sciences;" but we are indebted to Yale College, and to a "pious student," for informing us that there is an art called the "art of prophecy"!! We must thank our brother Editor of the metropolis of Pennsylvania for announcing to us this new art.

7. "The whole sanction of Christ and his Apostles." Mr. Brantly, in strong recrimination of some editors who denounced "breaking the ice" for the purpose of immersion, as a cruel, if not a murderous practice, uses the above phrase, showing that the New Testament authorizes the practice. But what is it that has a partial sanction of Christ, and the whole sanction of the Apostles? or the whole sanction of Christ, and the partial sanction of the Apostles? Or are there some things which have the whole sanction, and others which have the half sanction of the Saviour and his Apostles? But this zeal for the act of immersion is a rickety zeal, a sectarian zeal, unless accompanied with an equal zeal for the meaning of the institution, and for every other institution emanating from the same authority. There are some items in the christian institution of which Mr. B. speaks as irreverently as his neighbor editors speak of his immersion; and we might retort upon him, and use all his own language in application to himself, provided only it were chaste and intelligible. We pass by such phrases as the following—"perpetrated a singularity"—"carried (a right) into effect"—"aiding and witnessing noble devotion"—"somewhat of the latest"—because they are only the little extravagancies of a sportive fancy, not tamed by the restraints of a strict literary discipline. We attend only to such phrases as mislead the reader in his religious course.

8. "Ministers of the holy book, (who are they?) ministers of the churches." They are those "who impart to them spiritual gifts." Spiritual gifts, in Paul's mouth, meant gifts of healing, of prophecy, of interpreting foreign languages; all miraculous powers. But it seems that Mr. Brantly's ministers of the holy book have got a new sort of spiritual gifts, which they impart; and he tells us that those churches who pay "their ministers well," are "enriched with all needful gifts and graces." Mr. Brantly's church must, then, be like that in Corinth, "behind in no gift," "enriched in all utterance and in all knowledge"!

This must suffice for No. 1. I dare not attempt to scan his "moral estimate of the character of Dr. Payson." He says the Doctor had "a great deal of character;" and, indeed, he has said "a great deal" about it which, were it to be examined, would afford matter for a duodecimo. More than half the allusions to the holy scriptures are as manifest perversions as I have read; and the false views of christianity which it exhibits, interspersed occasionally with a good remark, like a grain of wheat in a bushel of chaff, or a matured grape upon a blighted vine, only serve like "gilding to a pill" to conceal the bitterness which must sicken the unhappy patient who receives it, without the ability to cure, or any tendency to mitigate the malady under which he is about to expire.

EDITOR.

THE TIMES—*No. IV.*

IT is a misfortune, as far as human approbation is regarded, for any person to have to censure the times in which he lives: for in censuring the times, it is not the seasons of the year, but the people who live in the times, that are implicated. The political affairs of the nations are approaching some momentous crisis. The Lord will ere long avenge the infidelity, ingratitude, injustice, and blasphemy of the nations so long visited with his oracles.

He that pleads the rights of men and descants upon the political sins of the tyrants of the earth, even though all the signs of the times sustain him, is not, however, exempt from the censure of those who have the people in keeping for their own interest and behoof. Much less can he expect an exemption from contumely and reproach who implicates by hint, allusion, or accusation direct or implied, that the religious teachers and their pupils are generally out of, and far from, the way of godliness. The religious times have become most irreligious, and it is a question of no easy solution whether the religious state of the aggregate mass of the inhabitants of this country is more abhorrent to christianity than the despotism and ignorance of Mahometanism is to the sound faith and practice of republicanism.

But waving this question, we may safely say, that, although the mildness of our laws has taken from the priests and the religious tyrants the sword and the faggot, yet the press and the tongue are incessantly employed in turning the ears of the people from truth, and in criminating them who would rescue the conscience from the captivity of those who have long had it in their keeping. To speak of the times is, with many, equivalent to speaking against them: for *they* make the times, and if the creature be disparaged the creator feels himself insulted.

There is no hobby which has carried his rider through all sorts of roads with more ease and respectability, than the doctrine of *metaphysical regeneration,* or *spiritual operations.* Some holy ghost is the soul of every popular sermon, and the essential point in every evangelical creed.

If salvation were proposed to mankind upon condition that they must believe that they can do nothing, and that "the Holy Ghost"* will when he pleases, and not till then, fall down upon them and make them new creatures by convincing them of sin, righteousness, and judgment, these notions could not be more frequently asserted, more zealously propounded, nor more strenuously defended by those who claim to be evangelical preachers, nor more greedily devoured by their deluded admirers—I say, *deluded;* for every man who supposes he was converted to God by the literal descent of the Holy Spirit, or

*I use their own phrase. It is their own: for God's Spirit was never called a *ghost* by any Apostle, Prophet, or divinely instructed person. A *ghost* represents, in our tongue, the soul or apparition of a dead man. The Holy Ghost is, indeed, a better definition of their idea than Holy Spirit. When we use the phrase "Holy Ghost," we mean their phantom; by the phrase "Holy Spirit," we mean the Spirit of God.

by its naked influence upon his spirit, is as certainly deluded as the followers of *Joseph Smith*, who believe in his Golden Bible or the plates of Nephi. Many of these visionaries are good citizens, kind friends, and benevolent neighbors, and withal pious in their way. So are the Mormonites, the Shakers, and the disciples of Jemima Wilkinson. Others of them are evidently animal men and women.

But we care not what their seeming devotion nor their decent morality may be. Believing the testimony of God, we must pronounce them deluded. For in the New Testament no man is represented as converted by the descent or physical influence or internal operation of the Holy Spirit upon his mind. Not one. Nay, it is positively and repeatedly taught there that "the world," or unconverted men, "cannot receive the Holy Spirit;" and *it is never promised but to them who believe.*

But in the rage for sectarian proselytism, "the Holy Ghost" is an admirable contrivance. Every qualm of conscience, every new motion of the heart, every strange feeling or thrill —all doubts, fears, despondencies—horrors, remorse, &c. &c. are the work of this Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit is equivalent to the spirit of holiness, and its fruits are all goodness, gentleness, purity, peace, joy, &c. But not so the fruits of this evangelical Holy Ghost. To it is ascribed all the anguish, horror of conscience, lamentations and grief, which precede that calm called *regeneration*, so often witnessed in our greatest revivals.

In Rochester, New York, a wonderful revival of religion has been got up, in exact accordance with the spirit of the times. And that our readers may hear their own account of it, we shall present them with an extract from the North Star, of the 12th ult.—

REVIVAL IN ROCHESTER.

Extract from the account of the five days' meeting in Rochester, N. Y. which commenced on Thursday, 24th February last.

On Friday, as it was found that the numbers who assembled to hear preaching at the Second Church, could not get into the body of the house, a prayer meeting was held and very numerously attended at the same time, in the large session room of that church. On Saturday the press was so great at the Third Church, where Rev. Mr. Eddy preached, that a part of the multitude assembled withdrew to the Second Church, to whom a sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Barnard. It was found necessary to open the two churches in the evening.

Sabbath morning, being the communion season of the First Church, the supper was administered in the Second Church. The whole of the body of the house and half of the gallery was occupied by communicants. At the same time a sermon was delivered to a crowded audience in the large basement room of that church. The Third Church was also opened, and a sermon delivered there to an overflowing assembly.

Thus far almost all the meetings were attended with manifest tokens of the presence and power of God. Preachers and hearers seemed to regard themselves as sustaining a relation to each other as solemn as eternity. The naked truth was brought to bear with great pungency upon the hearts and consciences of the vast multitude assembled, and the Divine Spirit rendered his own instrument "quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword." But on Sabbath evening such a spectacle was presented as we have never before witnessed. During the day notice had been given in all the churches that Mr. Finney would preach in the Second Church in answer to the question, "What shall I

do to be saved?" All professing christians, and such as were indulging hopes in Rochester, were specially requested *not* to attend this meeting, but assemble at the basement room of that and at the Third Church, to pray for the descent of Holy Spirit upon the congregation of impenitent hearers, assembled under circumstances scarcely less solemn than the judgment itself.

At an early hour an immense concourse assembled, crowding every part of that large house, above and below, wherever an individual could sit or stand. At the same time the vestibule was filled, and great numbers were compelled to go away who could not possibly get within sound of the preacher's voice. We shall not attempt to describe, nor can the reader easily conceive, the impression made upon our mind in looking over this dense mass, as the preacher commenced his discourse. The consideration that so great a proportion of the christians of the village were at that moment assembled in different places for prayer; that a large majority of this vast assemblage were doubtless impenitent; that many were already wounded by the sword of the Spirit; that terms of reconciliation with God were to be proposed to, and acted upon, by every individual of this class; under such circumstances, that the destiny of many immortals must unquestionably be decided for heaven or hell, before the congregation should break up—spread a deep and pervading solemnity over every countenance, such as eternity alone when brought near to mind destined to share its momentous realities, is adapted to produce.

The discourse, which occupied about two hours, was listened to with increasing interest and solemnity from its commencement to its close. No individual of those who were compelled to stand during the whole time, discovered the least symptom of weariness, or appeared conscious of the period which had elapsed. All other feelings and considerations seemed to be lost in that intensity of interest which was concentrated upon the momentous subject to which the attention of all was then directed.

After the discourse was ended, in which the conditions of salvation were laid with perfect conspicuousness before every mind, all who had come to a fixed determination to accept at once, were requested to tarry after the congregation were dismissed, that special prayer might be offered in their behalf. The number which left was so small, that the crowd seemed hardly diminished, and the throng being still so great that it was impossible to separate the congregation without great inconvenience; those who were determined to accept at once the conditions of salvation, were requested to signify that determination by rising. Simultaneously hundreds arose from all parts of the house.

The whole congregation was then requested to kneel down, while four or five short, appropriate, and fervent prayers were offered up at the throne of grace. During this awfully solemn interval, when so great a congregation were upon their knees before God, it did seem that the heavens were dropping down righteousness over our heads; and that then, if ever, was the time that sinners must submit and humble themselves before an offended God and sovereign. We feel a perfect confidence that many did submit during this evening, so memorable in the history of the revival in this village; but how many, the Searcher of Hearts only can tell.

At this meeting such manifest tokens of the special presence of God were exhibited, it was deemed expedient to continue the meeting on the next day, and accordingly a meeting of inquiry was appointed at the basement room of the Second Church, at 9 o'clock, A. M. at which hour the room was crowded to overflowing with anxious sinners. A deep solemnity pervaded the assembly. A large number at this time expressed a hope of an interest in the Saviour. Many had previously left the village who had found peace to their souls during the meeting.

Here the storm was raised by "the proposition of the terms of reconciliation," by the answering of the question proposed on Pentecost, which Peter forgot to answer! by special prayer, and by the

Divine Spirit sharpening the sword and making that living which before was dead and inefficient. All the perturbation of mind produced by these deeds of violence against reason, revelation, and the Holy Spirit are ascribed to the "Holy Ghost;" and after this feverish excitement had subsided into a calm, this calm is the sweet period called *regeneration*. The former agitations were the pangs of the new birth; but in this instance it is not the *mother* that travails, but the *child;* for according to the new theory of this new spirit, all the regenerated are themselves the subjects of these fierce pangs of conscience and all imaginable distress as the first fruits of their Holy Ghost, before they are born again.

I cannot believe in the Rochester and Pentecostian Revivals. One of them I am compelled to reject. My reasons are many—a few I will present. Peter answered the question, "*What shall we do,*" in less than two minutes; but the Apostles of the Rochester Revival occupied two hours in answering the same question. The Rochester Apostle, in proposing his "terms of reconciliation," must, then, have had many more than Peter, and much more difficult to explain. Now as the old Apostle was certainly guided by the Holy Spirit, I must prefer *his* gospel terms to the gospel terms of this modern Apostle, although he claims a Holy Ghost.

Peter did not order all the disciples out of the house to the basement story to "pray for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the congregation of impenitent hearers;" but he promised the gift of the Holy Spirit to all who repented and were baptized. Peter's Holy Spirit did not descend upon the impenitent, consequently was not the same spirit which fell upon the Rochester "impenitent hearers." This new Holy Spirit I profess not to believe in; and therefore I cannot regard its work as genuine, nor its converts in any other light than that of deluded sinners. If the copy of the New Testament which I read had said there are *two* spirits of God, *two* bodies, *two* Lords, and *two* baptisms, I might have been in doubt upon the conversion of these Rochester impenitents; but as it speaks of only *one Spirit*, I cannot for a moment suppose them to be under the influence of that Spirit which Peter promised to the Pentecostian penitents.

"The tokens of the special presence of God," exhibited in proof of the new gospel, were not of that decisive character as those exhibited on Pentecost; for it is said, notwithstanding the descent of the Holy Spirit in the Rochester congregation, and "the evident tokens of the special presence of God exhibited," it was still necessary to "appoint another meeting, *for inquiry*, at the basement room of the Second Church." Now in old times, when tokens of the special presence were manifested, it was inexpedient and unbecoming to appoint meetings of inquiry; and therefore, "the manifest tokens" in Rochester are manifest proofs that the special presence there was not the special presence of the one God and Father of All, but of some other god since that time conceived and created.

Three good reasons are enough to excuse my infidelity in the whole affair of this Rochester Revival. But if any person will prove to me

that contraries are true, and that Peter did not answer the question 1800 years ago proposed to him on the terms of reconciliation, and that the Spirit whom the world could not then receive the world can now receive; I may then, but not till then, be induced to reconsider the grounds on which I reject this revival as the work of enthusiasts, and its converts as the deluded subjects of a new gospel.

This notice of the above affair, will no doubt draw down on us new denunciations of vengeance from the rulers of the darkness of this world, and from the spiritual courts in high places; but, really, if we hesitated on that account to remonstrate against delusion and clerical legerdemain, we should doubt whether we had a single fruit of that Holy Spirit which led its most distinguished subjects to the stake and to death in its most terrific forms. If we suffered these works of the flesh to pass without notice, or if we joined with the venal corps who trumpet every thing of this sort from North to South, as a lullaby to the consciences of their votaries and devotees, we would be self-condemned, as destitute of that courage which emboldened the ancient confessors of Jesus the Messiah.

We must occasionally notice the fanaticism of this age on the subject of *mystic impulses;* for, in our humble opinion, the constant proclamation of "the Holy Ghost" of the schoolmen, and all its influences, is the greatest delusion of this our age, and one of the most prolific causes of the infidelity, immorality, and irreligion of our cotemporaries.

EDITOR.

THE LYING SPIRIT OF THIS AGE.

THE following appeared in the *Connecticut Journal* of the 8th of February. In this way the public have news, religious and political, manufactured for them by those worthy gentlemen whose business it is to find or to invent news to suit the taste of their readers. In this way, too, is the public mind enlightened and directed to appropriate subjects. A venal and a lying press is one of the greatest misfortunes which can happen a reading community.

Ed. Mill. Harb.

"ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

"Several years ago this person had a long public discussion with Mr. *Robert Owen*, upon the subject of the Christian Religion. Since that period it seems Mr. Campbell has been settled over a Baptist congregation in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he has adopted a new religion, obtained proselytes, and started a religious paper devoted to his sect. In this paper he has published a creed, in which are found the following articles. Our readers will judge the modesty of the gentleman in styling all Christendom as Deists, and all the Colleges in Christendom seminaries of Deism:—

"1. There has been no preaching of the Gospel since the days of the Apostles.

"2. The people have been preached to from texts of scripture until they have been literally preached out of their senses.

"3. All the public preaching now necessary is to undo what has already been done.

"4. That John Calvin preached as pure Deism as was ever taught by Voltaire or Thomas Paine; and that this Deism is taught in all the Colleges in Christendom.

"5. That all the faith that men can have in Christ is historical.

"6. That the words '*little children*' in the New Testament, are to be understood literally.

"7. That faith is only a historical belief of facts stated in the Bible.

"8. That baptism, or immersion, actually washes away sin, and is regeneration.

"9. That baptism, or immersion, is made the first act of a Christian's life, or rather the regenerating act itself.

"And by some other articles this immersion is made the sole ground of the forgiveness of sins, and the only thing required in the New Testament as necessary to salvation!"

CROLY ON THE APOCALYPSE.

THE following sketch from the "Introduction to the Apocalypse," in a late work from the pen of George Croly, A. M. H. R. S. L. London, printed 1827, gives the outlines of the author's views of the important items of that most interesting book, becoming more so every day:—

THE Apocalypse is the great final prophecy of the Church of Christ, written by St. John, the last survivor of the Apostles, during his banishment in the Isle of Patmos, about the year of our Lord 97, in the time of the Emperor Domitian.

Its purpose was to prepare the Asiatic Churches for the impending persecution, which was to commence under the Emperor Trajan, and be continued until the acknowledgment of Christianity under the Emperor Constantine; and to detail to the universal Church the leading events of her future history down to the end of the world; showing that the true Faith should be either directly persecuted, or remain in a narrow and depressed state, during the whole human government of the earth: that it should, notwithstanding, be sustained; that its oppressors should be punished from time to time, until their final extinction by a consummate act of the Divine power and justice; and that the Church, the body of the faithful in all nations, should thenceforth enjoy a splendid and miraculous prosperity for a long, yet limited period, closing with the general resurrection.

The Apocalypse is a collection of Divine visions, seen probably at different times, yet all during the Apostle's exile. It consists of six distinct portions:—The Vision of the Asiatic Persecution.*—The Vision of the Seals, or general view of Providence in the government of the Church and the World, beginning with the period of Constantine, and ending with the close of the final age of Mankind.†—The Vision of the Trumpets,‡—the Vision of the Vials,‖ which two are

* Ch. i. ii. iii. † Ch. iv. v. vi. vii. ‡ Ch. viii. ix. x. xi.
‖ Ch. xv. xvi. with the connected chapters xvii. xviii. xix.

identical, and describe the inflictions laid upon the persecutors of the Church, beginning from the establishment of the Inquisition, and closing with the final ruin of the Popedom in the triumph of Christianity.—The Vision of the Church,§ distinguished into the three eras of Pagan persecution, Papal persecution, and the catastrophe of her oppressors.—The Vision of the triumph of Christianity.¶

It will be shown in the course of the Interpretation, that this prophecy includes in the most direct manner all those great events which make the frame-work of History since the first age of Christianity; that it distinctly predicts—

The establishment of the Church under Constantine and his successors.

The overthrow of the Roman Empire.

The erection of the Barbarian Kingdoms on its ruin.

The rise of the Popedom.

The establishment of the Inquisition.

The persecution of the first Reformers.

The successive punishments laid on Italy, Spain, and France, as the three powers by which the Inquisition was let loose against Protestantism; namely, The papal factions, and French wars of the fourteenth century.—The destruction of the Spanish Armada.—The civil war following the overthrow of Protestantism in France in 1685.—The wars of Louis the 14th.

The French Revolution; not narrowed into a few conjectural verses, as is usual; but detailed in an entire and unsuspected Chapter, with its peculiar characters of Atheism, and Anarchy; its subsequent despotism, and its final overthrow by the armies of Europe.

The cessation of the Inquisition, and the simultaneous and extraordinary diffusion of the Scriptures.

The remainder of the prophecy is future, and of course beyond any exact interpretation. But it contains the most unquestionable predictions of events, to the magnitude and fierceness of whose havoc of the power, the institutions, and the lives of mankind, all the past inflictions are trivial. It is fully predicted that there shall be a sudden revival of Atheism, superstition, and religious violence, acting upon the European nations until they are inflamed into universal war. All the elements of terror and ruin shall be roused; Protestantism persecuted; Popery, after a momentary triumph, utterly destroyed; in a general shock of kingdoms, consummated by some vast and palpable development of the Divine Power, at once protecting the Church, and extinguishing in remediless and boundless devastation, infidelity and idolatry.

Apparently for the express purpose of compelling us to believe in a catastrophe so repugnant to our natural impressions and the usual course of the world, this visitation is prophesied no less than four times;* each time with some added terror, and the last with the most

§ Ch. xii. xiii. xiv. ¶ Ch. xx. xxi. xxii.

* At the close of the Visions of the Seals, the Trumpets, the Vials, and the Church.

overwhelming accumulation of the images of individual and national ruin. It takes successively the language of the prophets exulting over the fall of the great and opulent cities of the east, the broken sceptres, the spoiled wealth and burning palaces and temples of Tyre and Babylon; and of the still sterner denunciations over the crimes of Jerusalem; the images of wild and sudden invasion, and hopeless battle, the massacre, the conflagration, the final crush of polity, power and name. Even the agencies of nature are summoned to deepen the prediction; earthquakes and subterraneous fire, lightnings, and ponderous and fatal hail. And in the midst of this chaos of bloodshed, fire and tempest, towers the form of the Avenger, flashing with terrible lustre; crowned and armed with the power and wrath of Deity against a world that has for so many ages of long-suffering resisted his Spirit, worshipped idols, and enslaved and slain his people—God, a consuming fire!

It is further declared that this catastrophe is now approaching hour by hour; the French Revolution standing as the last great event before it; with but a brief intervening period, occupied by Providence in preparing and securing the Church; in spreading the Scriptures, and in giving a last opportunity to the unbeliever and the idolater to accept the truth of God.

The Apocalypse thus assumes the rank of not merely an elucidation of the Divine will in the past, nor an evidence of the general truth of Christianity, but of a WARNING, of the highest and most pressing nature, to all men, in the entire range of human society. It is not the mere abstract study of the theologian, nor the solitary contemplation of the man of piety. But a great document addressed to the mighty of the earth; Wisdom calling out trumpet-tongued to the leaders of national council; the descended Minister of Heaven, summoning for the last time the nations to awake to the peril already darkening over their heads, and cut themselves loose from those unscriptural and idolatrous faiths, with which they must otherwise go down; the Spirit of God, commanding the teachers and holders of the true faith to prepare themselves by the cultivation of their powers, by a vigilant purity, by a generous and hallowed courage, for that high service of God and man in which they may so soon be called on to act, and perhaps to suffer; and proclaiming to all men alike the infinite urgency of redeeming the time before the arrival of a period, that to the whole world of idolatry, European and barbarian, shall come with a civil ruin, of which the subversion of Jerusalem was but a type; and with a physical destruction, that can find no parallel but in the inevitable fury of the Deluge.

Yet, vague as those combinations of all the forms of public calamity may appear, we are not left without the means of approaching a more distinct conception. It will be shown in the course of the volume, that this final infliction bears a very singular resemblance to the procedure of the French Revolution; the difference being chiefly in magnitude. The commencement of the French Revolution in Atheism and anarchy, the spirit of hostility to all nations, the sudden change

of the whole people into a soldiery, the indignities offered to the popedom, the captivity of sovereigns, the suspension or change of laws and establishments, and even the means by which those horrors were partially combatted and restrained—all find their counterparts in the final plague. The chief distinctions are, that the latter, instead of being limited to Europe, incomplete, and apparently under the sole influence of human means, will be universal, complete, and, at least towards the close, palpably influenced by the action or presence of the Deity.

The synopsis given by Mr. Croly is exhibited in the following columns, showing the parallelism of the three great chapters of the Apocalypse. In his view, the correspondence of the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Vials, may be presented in the following arrangement.— ED.

THE FUTURE.

The Apocalypse is henceforth a *fasciculus* of predictions, explaining each other by their parallelism. The same events are frequently repeated, as in the prophecies of the Old Testament; but under different points of view. Apparently for the purpose of introducing order into those involvements and repetitions, three regular series of periods are given:—the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Vials. The first two immediately in the commencement of this portion of the prophecy; the third at a certain distance, being preceded by some chapters necessary to its elucidation. In the following table a general view of the three series is given. The Seals commence with the close of the great persecution in the fourth century, and comprehend the whole course of Providence down to the consummation of all things. The Trumpets and Vials commence with the close of the great persecution in the thirteenth century, are contemporaneous, and typify the punishments visited on the chief persecutors of the reformed.

TABLE OF THE SEALS, TRUMPETS, AND VIALS.

THE SEALS.	THE TRUMPETS.	THE VIALS.
1. The establishment of Christianity.		
2. The fall of the Western Empire.		
3. The Papacy.		
comprehending	1. The Papal and French wars of the fourteenth century.	1. The plague of the fourteenth century.
	2. The destruction of the Spanish Armada.	2. The destruction of the Spanish Armada.
	3. The war of the Cevennes.	3. The war of the Cevennes.
	4. The wars of Louis XIV.	4. The wars of Louis XIV.
4. The French Revolution.	5. The French Revolution.	5. The seizure of Rome in the French Revolution.
5. An interval.	6. The overthrow of the Revolution.	6. The overthrow of the Revolution.
6. The universal war.	7. The universal war.	7. The universal war.
7. The triumph of the Church.		

THE FIRST REFORMERS.

THOSE who more especially merit that title were Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Martyr, Bullinger, Beza, Œcolampadius, and others. Now these were *all* men of learning, who came forth into the field of controversy, in which the fate of future ages, with respect to liberty, was to be decided, with a kind of arms that did not at all give them the aspect of persons agitated by the impulse, or seduced by the delusions of fanaticism. They pretended not to be called to the work they undertook by visions, or internal illuminations and impulses; they never attempted to work miracles, nor pleaded a divine commission; they taught no new religion, nor laid claim to any extraordinary vocation; they respected government, practised and taught submission to civil rulers, and desired only the liberty of that conscience which God has made free, and which ceases to be conscience if it be not free. They maintained that the faith of christians was to be determined by the word of God alone; they had recourse to reason and argument, to the rules of sound criticism, and to the authority and light of history. They translated the Scriptures into the popular languages of different countries, and appealed to them as the only test of religious truth. They exhorted christians to judge for themselves, to search the Scriptures, to break asunder the bonds of ignorant prejudice and lawless authority, and to assert that liberty of conscience to which they had an unalienable right as reasonable beings.—[*Moshcim's Eccl. Hist. by Archibald Maclaine, vol.* iii. p. 110.

—

CAMPBELLISM.

At any rate, before I am converted to his views I shall wait to see how far his followers go before us in favoring Bible and Tract Societies; in establishing Missions, Sabbath Schools, and Dorcas Societies; in supplying the poor with clothing and fuel; in erecting alms-houses and hospitals; and in visiting the poor, sick, and distressed in prison. I shall inquire how many of the new system folks have died in the cold of Greenland and Labrador? how many have been scorched with the sun in Burmah or Siberia? how many have visited the Islands of the Pacific? how many labor among the convicts in New Holland, or the negroes of the West Indies? how many braved the perils of the ocean, stooped into the wigwam of the Indian, and krall of the Hottentot? how many have assailed the strong holds of Popish and Mahomedan delusion? in fine, how many have given their reputation, property, and very blood for the cause of God and his truth?

There are instances of this kind you know under our imperfect system, and under a better one, (like Mr. Campbell's.) I have reason to expect instances more numerous and splendid. There were instances of this sort in the first and purest age of the church; and the system which comes nearest to it will, in this respect, most resemble it.

Baptist Repository.

REMARKS.

Three years ago, in like manner, as a child, did I think and write. In my first letter to Mr. Campbell, dated March 13, 1828, I said to him: "Your opposition and sideway course to Sunday Schools, Bible Societies, Tract and Missionary Societies, with considerable that has appeared on the ambassadors of Christ, call to preach, &c. I regard as wrong." To this he replied: "As you have been so candid as to state the objections you have to the contents of the Christian Baptist, I will just remark, that I am pleased to find that they are chiefly about things never so much as once named in the Bible; and therefore, however important in their supposed consequences, they are proper matters of forbearance. In these matters and things I am content to say, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind; or, let him examine the grounds of his assent, and the reasons of his preferences, and then let him act with energy. For my part, I take but little interest in discussing the merits of these 'benevolent schemes,' and have never done more in my remarks upon them, than in general terms to say, that they are no part of the christian institution. They may, indeed, be supposed by some to result from it legitimately; be it so:—I will grant them, so far as I am allowed to grant, the liberty of so thinking; only let them not attempt to impose their opinions upon me."

I had then read only a *part* of his writings, and these hastily *once:* (how many form their judgments and condemn from reading less!) I have since read them *all.*

But what is *Campbellism?* It is an invention of Mr. Campbell's, a speculation, doctrine, deduction, notion or opinion, which originated with him. And who are *Campbellites?* They are those, if such there be, though I know of none, who have united on, and whose bond of union is, some one or more of these—That the scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a revelation from Heaven, a complete, and the only sufficient rule of faith and practice; that it is eternal life to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he has commissioned; that faith is faith, or belief; that it comes from hearing, and this hearing by the word of God; that the word is spirit and life, and the sword of the Spirit; that all who believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the living God, should reform and obey the glad tidings, and be immersed for the remission of their sins; that such are in Christ as have put him on; that there is no condemnation for such, *who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit;* that all such should love one another with a pure heart fervently, and meet together on the first day of the week to break bread; that they should incite one another to love and good works: and as to whatever things are true, whatever things are benevolent, whatever things are of good fame, if there be any virtue, and if any praise be due, that they should attentively consider these things,—*is not Campbellism;* and to build on *this* foundation, *is not to be a Campbellite:* but numbers of such I know. F.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

ON TOTAL DEPRAVITY AND METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION.—*No. I.*

DEAR SIR:

I propose, in this communication, to offer a few thoughts on "Total Depravity," which is the root and hinge, and the key to the controversy which has been carried on by Metaphysicians since the days of Austin, who flourished in the fifth century. Christianity was four hundred years old before "decrees," or predestination, special operations, total depravity, particular election and redemption, were born. Milner, the panegyrist of Austin, says, Vol. 1 p. 467, that particular redemption was unknown to this saint, the father of orthodoxy. Mosheim says, Vol. 1, Century 4, p. 286, that "the controversial writings of the fourth century were entirely destitute of that ancient simplicity which is the natural and beautiful garb of truth;" that "simplicity was now succeeded by logical subtleties, acute sophisms, sharp invectives, and other disengenuous acts, more worthy of the patrons of error, than of the defenders of *the wisdom that is from above*." In the days of Moses, it was sound doctrine to tell the Jews that life and good, death and evil, were set before them; and to entreat and command them to CHOOSE life: but now this doctrine is unsound, under the gospel dispensation, since the faculties of men have attained to their manhood, (then they were in their infancy.)

We must wait for previous operations, in order to produce faith and holy disposition—see Deut. xxx. 15. 19. It was sound doctrine in the days of Joshua to tell men to CHOOSE you this day whom you will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served, &c.—see Joshua xxiv. 5. 15.—Deut. xi. 26. Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse, &c.—2 Sam. xxiv. 5. 11. 12. It was sound doctrine in the time of David for God to say to him—I offer thee three things; CHOOSE thee one of them, that I may do it unto thee. The bold and eloquent Isaiah said to the men—the wicked Jews of his generation, compared by him to the Sodomites and Ghomorahites—Cease to do evil; learn to do well. Paul said to Philemon, from verse 5 to 14—That thy benefit should not be as it were of NECESSITY, but WILLINGLY. Paul said again to the Corinthians, i. 7. 5. 37. Having no *necessity*, but hath POWER over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart, &c. Here Paul expressly affirms that a man hath power over his own will. No, no, says the orthodox preacher, that cannot be so, Paul. John i. 12. To as many as received him, to them gave or granted he power or privilege to BECOME the sons of God. James i. 15. Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God—every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust, (not by a divine decree,) and enticed, &c. God told the Jews, Is. lxv. 5. 12. that they did CHOOSE that wherein I delighted not;—No, no, says the popular preacher, this is that abominable doctrine of "Free Will" again.—see Ezekiel viii. 5. 11. 15. 1 Sam. vi. 5. Why do you harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their

hearts. Ps. xcv. 5. 8—Ezek. xviii. 32—Matth. xxiii. 37—Rom. 10. All the day long have I stretched forth my hands, like an orator, &c. Rev. i. 24. 25. Because I have called and ye refused. Thus we see that the called and sent among the Jews and Christians, the Prophets, Apostles, and the Saviour, addressed men in this manner. But now they must be addressed differently. They must sit still till they are "divinely illuminated," "specially called by divine grace," like water falling upon a mill-wheel; and if it never falls, they will be *excusable*, (not inexcusable, as Paul said;) but the popular doctrine says he will be damned to the praise of his "vindictive justice." The sects all have a Calvinistic creed, but an Arminian priesthood; for all the sects exhort men to choose and refuse, notwithstanding the creed says they cannot choose. When the sects hear a man curse, or see him murder or steal, they do not tell him to go on till "efficaciously called by divine grace;" they tell him to cease to do evil, and learn to do well. The Bible and the creeds are at war, and so do the sects war against their own creeds. Austin himself, the great grand father of the Five Points, who christened and married the Five Points, says, "God created man with a free will; and that all sin comes from the ill use of that free will; and that all other evils are punishments for sin; and that every one shall be judged according as he has either used that freedom of will to good, or abused it to evil. See Augustinus de Libro Arbi Trio, lib. iii. chap. 23. Buck says, article Calvinists, p. 72, "The Calvinists do not consider predestination, however, as affecting the agency or accountableness of creatures, or as being to them any rule of conduct. On the contrary, they suppose them to act as *freely*, and to be as much the proper subjects of calls, warnings, exhortations, promises, and threatenings, as if no decree existed." This is sound doctrine again; here they preach "free will;" no operations or omnipotent power is heard of here; no decree to influence us. Mosheim says, Vol. 1, p. 396, "This controversy, (in the fifth century, about free will and free grace, orignal sin, &c.) was the commencement of those unhappy contests, those subtle and perplexing disputes concerning grace, or the nature and operation of that divine power, which is spiritually required in order to salvation, that rent the church into the most deplorable divisions through the whole course of the succeeding age, and which to the deep regret and sorrow of every true and generous christian, have been continued down to the present time." He says, that silence is the truest wisdom, upon this intricate and incomprehensible subject. I shall close this essay by promising to give my reasons in my next for touching this subject.

MOSES.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

"TOTAL DEPRAVITY."—*No. II.*

DEAR SIR:

IN my last essay, I promised to give my reasons in this for touching upon this orthodox dogma. My first reason is, to show that the phrase "total depravity," (upon the belief of which some make our

salvation to depend) is not found in the Book. I suppose that it will be admitted, that the Sermon on the Mount was an orthodox sermon; and yet, strange to tell, we cannot find one of the Five Points in it, nor in the one delivered by Peter on Pentecost. The five subtle and perplexing dogmas of orthodoxy were not generated until the fifth century; this, Luther himself, who was educated an Augustinian Monk, acknowledged. My principal reason is, that I design to take some notice of the essays of "Noel's man Dillard," written upon the subject of total depravity, and some other loose speculations. This man is the successor of Mr. Vardeman at David's Fork. Mr. Vardeman was once an Arminian; then he embraced the general provision, but special application plan; then he either *apostatized* from these two faiths and embraced the Particular faith, or else Mr. Dillard has *apostatized* from the Particular faith and embraced Mr. Vardeman's two faiths, and will probably be admitted into the Elkhorn Association with all three of these faiths. Mr. Vardeman's apostacy cost him his removal from Kentucky. We shall leave it with these men to say which of them has apostatized, and shall proceed. Dillard is the man who has repeatedly, in the presence of hundreds and thousands, in a *snolus bolus* manner contradicted the Apostle Peter, by telling the people that they must be baptized, "but not for the remission of their sins." This is the man who was chosen Bully at the last Elkhorn Association, and who produced the fable of Dr. Franklin respecting an eagle catching a cat to prove that it was right for the Association to violate her own word given on Saturday, and her own resolution spread upon her minutes in 1827, and also her former proceedings, and her constitution, by dropping two of her churches. This is the man who was presiding in the Clear creek church, when he and the church were informed by a committee from another church that they were about to send a *falsehood* to the Association, in their letter; yet he proceeded to send it. It can be proved by records, and hundreds of witnesses, that it was a falsehood; and that he knew it at the time.

After all this, there is but little need for him to prove that he is "totally depraved;" for I presume that no one who knows him will doubt this. It may be, one reason why he delights to dwell so frequently on the blackness of the sinner's heart is, that he is conscious that he possesses an uncommon share of *depravity*. The object of his first essay is to prove that God's spirit makes orthodox Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians; but as for Arminians, Arians, Unitarians, &c. he did not stop to tell us who made them. He speaks often of the divisions produced among these good christians by the reformation. His main proposition on "total depravity" reads as follows:—"Indeed, so incurable is the malady of sin in mortals, that nothing short of an omnipotent hand can relieve and restore them to health again." August No. page 115 he says the gospel is not the power of God to those that believe, until it is "*prepared*." According to this spiritual guide, the gospel believed and obeyed is insufficient "to restore man to happiness" without an omnipotent hand is put

forth, like it was when he garnished the heavens. According to him the Creator made a book, but he forgot to put a preface to it; now he has to come and put a preface to it for every sinner that is converted. This may be good divinity, but it is bad logic. According to this logic it is unnecessary to preach to an unconverted man, for preaching can only profit those whom the Spirit has *regenerated*, or for whom he has "prefaced the book, until they are regenerated, or "prefaced;" they can neither hear, understand, believe, nor obey. You had as well preach to an audience who understand the English language only, in Hebrew as in English, till this operation, preface, or regeneration is performed. Preaching is unnecessary before the preface, and it is equally unnecessary afterwards; so that it is altogether unnecessary. An omnipotent hand does not need us to help him do his own work, nor does he need us afterwards. He needs no help. MOSES.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

REMARKS ON *MATHETEUO.*——MATT. xxviii. 19.

1. WHOEVER, on any subject, or respecting any thing, receives information from another, constitutes himself by that action, a learner, scholar, or disciple, and acknowledges the person from whom his information is received, to be his actual teacher or master: nor would it be an abuse of language to say to the parties, between which such intercourse occurs, master and scholar, teacher and disciple.

2. But the existence of this relation, and propriety of employing these correlates, become more obvious when the person from whom information is sought or received, sustains the character or profession of a teacher.

3. The existence, however, of this relation, and the propriety of these reciprocal terms, become more obvious when one person formally professes to be a scholar, and another formally engages to act to his professed disciple the part of a teacher.

4. To create a disposition to become a scholar, formally or informally, two things, and two things only, seem to be requisite; first, credible information concerning the disposition and ability of a teacher to execute his undertaking; and secondly, a conviction that what he professes to teach is important, or calculated to benefit the learner.

5. The Greek language employs the verb *matheteuo* to denote each of the above mentioned grades of this relation, and the writers of the New Testament employ it without doubt to denote either of the two last. For in it persons are frequently styled disciples or learners, who sought or received information from Christ and his Apostles, but who never assumed the title of formal or professed disciples; that is, who were occasional, but not constant or professed attendants on their instruction.

6. Now which of these degrees of this relation is *matheteuo* intended to denote in Matthew xxviii. 19.? This query, the context, as in all similar cases, must resolve. Were the first clause of this verse

to be translated literally and accurately into plain English, it would speak thus—"Go and induce *all* the nations (no doubt by presenting to them credible information concerning Christ's disposition and ability to teach them, and also concerning the complete fitness and absolute necessity of his instruction to render them happy) to become my disciples;" and this translation of the clause would evidently leave it uncertain whether more than the first or second grade of the relation alluded to, was intended: but the subsequent clauses which contain the connected and explanatory terms *baptisontes* and *didaskontes*, remove every doubt, and show that the last is also included. The term *matheteuo*, therefore, turned into plain English, as due respect to these annexed terms requires, will speak thus—"Go and induce (no doubt by the means already stated) *all* the nations to become not only secretly and in fact, but openly and avowedly my disciples, scholars, or learners." It is not, then, only a casual, or even a real, but concealed scholarship, which is here enjoined; but also an open, avowed, and formal one, of which immersion and subsequent attendance on public christian instruction are the proper and appointed expressions and proofs.

This passage, then, correctly translated, affords much important information:—

1. It teaches us that some information concerning Christ's character as a teacher, and concerning the fitness of his instruction to profit the learner, is absolutely necessary to dispose persons to become his disciples.

2. It teaches us that the diffusion of this preliminary information merits the particular attention of every friend to the Redeemer.

3. It teaches us that there may be a real scholarship without a concomitant avowal of it: nay, that a secret and real scholarship must precede a public profession of it, otherwise the public profession of it must be an act of downright hypocrisy. And here a question of importance occurs. Is a real but unavowed discipleship of no other benefit to its owner, than to put him in a condition to make a public profession without hypocrisy? Certain it is, that before immersion, or any other avowal of his christian attainments, a person may have read, understood, and believed every declaration which God has made, may have apprehended clearly and strongly the tendency of these declarations to affect not only his temporal but his eternal happiness also, and may have had his mind thus greatly enlightened and powerfully impressed; his affections much excited and drawn to God; and his actions duly rectified by them; in short, may have had all the elements of a christian—knowledge, faith, love, and obedience produced in him: and must we consider all this as null and void till there be a public annunciation of its inward and invisible existence? Truly I cannot believe it: yet, at the same time, I admit that when a person is convinced, and for the want of such a conviction I can see no excuse, that a public avowal of what the Lord has done for his soul, is the Lord's express command, and expressly commanded, because of its signal utility to Christ's cause; nothing being equally

well calculated to promote its prosperity, as its public profession well sustained; if, I say, he does not submit to public immersion and subsequent christian tuition, he is in a most alarming and dangerous condition, denying God's right to govern and use him, and of course exposed to the awful threat recorded Matth. vii. 21. that not every one that is in the practice of calling me Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. Let those therefore who are conscious of being in this woful condition, make all possible haste to escape out of it.

4. It is clear as solar light that none can be within the purlieu of this command, none embraced in its language, but those whose minds have arrived at such a degree of maturity as can enable them to understand the *information* offered to their attention for the purpose of disposing them to become in their own proper persons Christ's disciples, and who still retain the exercise of that degree of rationality; for to become Christ's disciples in or through the persons of others, through proxies or substitutes, is not only absurd, but impossible. From yielding obedience then to this command; by the very nature of it are excluded all human beings whose mental state is not such as can enable them to examine the credibility of the information concerning Christ and his doctrine, which is absolutely necessary to dispose them to become in reality his disciples.

5. It is equally manifest, that the author of this command considers none to be fit subjects of immersion, and subsequent christian tuition, but those whose minds are not only capable of being by suitable information concerning him and his doctrine made willing to become his disciples, but who have by such information been actually induced to become his real disciples. For it is evident, that they are the same persons who according to this command are to be induced to become disciples, and who are afterwards to be immersed, and provided with further christian instruction. Idiots and infants, therefore, the one on account of the imbecility, the other on account of the immaturity of their minds, are by this command excluded from immersion, as being destitute of the information and dispositions which immersion presumes to be present in all its subjects.

6. It is further evident, that when a person of mature and sound mind declares, that he has by attending to the declarations of sacred writ concerning Christ and his doctrine been induced to become his *real* disciple, and wishes to become his *avowed* disciple, he has a right to demand immersion from any professed disciple of the Redeemer, unless something in his visible conduct justify refusal.

7. It is further evident, that though the terms *matheteusate*, *baptisontes*, *didaskontes*, contained in this command, are closely connected, not only grammatically, but as denoting the very same persons or subjects of action; for it is undeniable, that they are the same persons, on whom the actions denoted by *matheteusate*, *baptisontes*, *didaskontes*, are performed; yet they are by no means synonymous, that is, they do not denote the same action. For who will contend that to induce persons, by scriptural information concerning Christ and his

doctrine, to become his *real* disciples, and afterwards by immersion to constitute them his *avowed* disciples, and provide them with further means of christian instruction, are one and the same action? Surely it is plain as daylight, that the first of these terms denotes the action which makes persons *real* disciples, and the two last, the actions which constitute them *professed* disciples.

8. It is also evident that the English terms teach, convert, disciple, proselyte, have been unhappily chosen to express the meaning of *mathetcusate* in this place. To teach, and to prevail on persons, by presenting to their minds what the scripture declares concerning Christ as a competent and willing teacher, and the fitness of his doctrine to secure to his students eternal happiness, to become his real disciples, are quite different operations; and convert, in its religious acceptation, denotes something very different from becoming either a real or professed disciple. It denotes the dereliction of one course of action, and the prosecution of another, effected by a belief, that the former is calculated to destroy the pursuer's happiness, and the latter to promote it. Disciple, used as a verb, is scarcely an English word, at best a very ambiguous one; and proselyte, though in its modern use it may convey the meaning of *matheteuo* in this passage pretty nearly, is inadmissible, because in the New Testament it uniformly denotes the inducing of heathens to become, not christians, but Jews.

9. In these remarks I have purposely avoided the word commission, and employed the word command: First, because the words commission and command are far from being synonymous; secondly, because it is evidently a command, and not a commission, which is presented to our view in this passage; and thirdly, because when translating God's message, or expressing our own sentiments on the all-important subject of religion, we can never be too scrupulous in the selection of precise and appropriate terms. From inattention to this matter, truth seems to have suffered more than from any other cause; and till the practice of calling every thing by its own strict and proper name be introduced and rigidly observed, it must suffer.

But to express the substance of these remarks in a few words, Christ in this passage (Matth. xxviii. 19) commands not only Jews, but all human beings, whose minds are capable of performing the action, to be first induced to become his *real* disciples, and then by immersion to become his *avowed* disciples, and forthwith to enter on his prescribed course of christian tuition PHILALETHES.

It has been acknowledged by all the learned that we have not a word in our tongue exactly corresponding to the term *matheteuo*. *Disciple*, a Roman term, would have exactly done, had it not been appropriated to another use. *Convert* expresses the effect, and therefore only metonymically expresses the import of the original. An avowed and open disciple is a convert, because he has abandoned one leader and adopted a new one; and as Jesus intended to induce all the nations to desert all religious leaders and to follow him for eternal life, there is, perhaps, no one word in our tongue which better represents, though

it does not literally translate the original term. But with many religious persons the term *convert*, and its derivative *conversion*, signifies sometimes more and sometimes less than to induce a person to avow, or the making of a public avowal of, Jesus as the Messiah, the only prophet, priest and king worthy of unrivalled and supreme regard. Hence with some it is a heinous sin against sound doctrine to say, "Go and convert the nations;" presuming that the Lord would not, and could not, command human agents to do a work which was wholly his own: But "he that converts a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death," is a form of speech which they must approve, because the king's version approves it. But this is only to bring a sinner back to the way from which he had turned aside.

EDITOR.

THE WORSHIP OF MOLOCH.

THERE is little pleasure in describing scenes of horror, but they are useful; they show us the evils of a false religion, and should make us thankful for the enjoyment of the true. Let it be known, then, to the disgrace of the Jews, that, although in possession of the knowledge and worship of the true God, they were but too much inclined to the worship of idols; and that there, in the valley of Tophet, they erected an altar to one of those agents, which God employs for the benefit of the world. The solar fire was erected into a divinity. An idol of brass, having the head of an ox, but the body of a man, was made to represent it. That idol was seated on a throne of the same metal; a crown was placed upon its head, and its hands were extended to receive their gifts. But what gifts were deemed most acceptable? Had garlands of roses, baskets of fruit, or the lives of animals been the only request, it had been comparatively well: but human sacrifices were demanded; and the tender pledges of conjugal love must glut the rapacity of this fictitious divinity. The hollow idol was heated to redness; the parent himself, by a refinement of cruelty, in order to acquire the summit of sanctity, must become the priest—himself must place his darling on its arms. No bewitching smiles, nor mournful cries, must drive him from his purpose. His eye must not pity, nor his ear regard. His heart must be steeled against every tender impression, and a complete conquest obtained over the strongest feelings of humanity. Fortunately the scene lasted not long; sacred drums, as they were impiously called, drowned their cries: their bodies became the victims of a merciless superstition; but their souls fled to a merciful God.—From this account of the worship of Moloch, we may see the origin of those names which marked the place where he was worshipped: for it was called the valley of the sons of Hinnom, or the valley of the sons or children which shrieked; and the valley of Tophet, or of drums, from their being constantly used on such an occasion. The following extract from D. Kimchi, on 2 Kings xxiii. 10. will show the arts which were used to excite the devotion of the worshippers, and at the same time explain, perhaps, what we are to understand by "the tabernacle of Moloch,"

which is mentioned in Acts vii. 43:—"Our rabbins, of happy memory," says he, "inform us, that although all other houses of idolatry were in Jerusalem, Moloch was without it, and the image was made hollow, and sat within seven chapels. Whosoever offered a flower, they opened to him the first of these; whoso offered turtles or pigeons, they opened to him the second; whoso offered a lamb, they opened to him the third; whoso offered a ram, they opened to him the fourth; whoso offered a calf, they opened to him the fifth; whoso offered an ox, they opened to him the sixth; but whoso offered his son, they opened to him the seventh."—*Brown's Antiquities, p.* 61—62.

BEING LED BY THE SPIRIT.

IN a sermon which I read the other day, I found the following passage. The author of the sermon was a Baptist of high standing in England, and one who has been highly extolled by many who denounce the author of this work as an errorist. One would suppose that a Baptist author, of so much good sense as appears in the following extract, would be denounced as unregenerate: but we will not add his name—we shall leave our readers to guess. I will only add, he is one of the most learned of the Baptist writers. *Ed. M. H.*

"Having thus seen the rise and the accomplishment of the promise of an universal religion under the administration of Jesus Christ, and having got possession of the book that contains the whole of that religion, let us proceed to examine the book, and particularly with a view to the Holy Spirit, and his influence in religion, for "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." To give you at once my notion of the subject, I think our Apostle took his idea of the Christian church being "led" by the Spirit, from that favorite part of the history of his country so often mentioned in the writings of the Prophets, and so faithfully recorded by their first historian, Moses; I mean God's "leading" the Israelites through the wilderness into the land of promise. Sometimes it is said simply, "God led them" through the wilderness. Sometimes it is said, the Holy Spirit led them "by the right hand of Moses." Sometimes they are said to be led "with a cloud, and with a light of fire;" and in this manner the wise men of the East were led by a star to Jesus Christ. God in all these cases made use of means, and the work was no less his for using means to effect his purpose. In this manner I suppose the Holy Spirit by the Scriptures guides all good men. The cloud was not in the Israelites, nor was the star in the wise men; but there was in them a knowledge of the use and intent of these appearances, and a conformity of action to their own ideas.

Here, then, two things rise to view in our subject—a guide without us, and a disposition within us; and the last seems to me to be an effect of the first, and both the work of one and the same spirit. Suppose a world without a Bible, and you have no idea of any Spirit of God as a spirit of religion in the inhabitants of it. Suppose, on the other hand, a Bible in a world without an inhabitant, and you have no notion of influence: the "Spirit of God" is there, but nothing knows or worships him, "the earth is without form and void, and darkness is upon the face of the deep." If God calls for light, it will come; if for land and water, they will appear; if for sun, and moon, and stars, they will be; if for fish, and fowl, and beasts, they will appear; but there will be no religion till man comes, nor then any revealed religion till the book and the man meet, and then the child of God will be "led by the Spirit of God." My supposition is a fact. The Bible lies about in many parts of the world without readers, and there lies all our holy religion like Jesus dead in the sepulchre. There are, on the contrary, many places where the Bible is read; but it is not among men, but mere

animals, who eat and drink, and marry and give in marriage, and buy and sell, and build and plant, and are so full of these ideas, that they never attend to religious truth, before death comes and destroys them all. "So it was in the days of Noah, so it was also in the days of the Son of Man," and so it will be to the end of the world. In a word, there is no magic in the Bible to operate without reason and conscience; and there is no religion in man without revelation. If we lay aside the Scriptures we have no standard to judge by; and if we have no judgment the standard is of no use.

Let us apply these general observations to particular cases, in order to understand how the Spirit of God "leads" all good men. We have determined that it is by means of Scripture truths, and that it implies the exercise of some dispositions in us. I am aware of the questions you will ask, and I only defer stating the question till it comes properly before us, as it will presently by supposing a case, which is not a mere supposition, because it comes to pass every day. Suppose a man, who had never thought of religion, to lose by death the first of all earthly pleasures, the agreeable partner of his life, or, as a Prophet calls his wife, "the desire of his eyes." O dreadful calamity, sound fit to raise the dead! "Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke! I spake unto the people in the morning, and at even my wife died." Awhile the man thunderstruck can hardly believe it true, and hopes against hope, till time, cruel time, kills his hope, and drives him to despair. The more he thinks, the more occasion he sees for grief. Every thing he sees pierces him to the heart, and in every place a lovely picture of her that was, and the ghastly features of her that is no more, meet his eyes, and melt down all his soul in woe. The sun does not shine, the stars do not sparkle, the flowers do not scent, the world does dot look as it used to do; the world seems dead, his house is a tomb, and all his domestics dreary ghosts. Now he feels the vanity of the world, takes up his Bible, perhaps to look after the desire of his eyes, and try whether he can find any thing in her present state to assuage his pain. This man hath religion to seek, and it is indifferent which end of the Bible he begins at—either will "lead" him right. If with the Prophets, they will hand him on from one to another, till they conduct him downward to Christ; if with the Apostles, they will direct him upward to the same person, who is a "light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of the people of Israel." This man, thus led to Christ, will be instructed by reading his sermons, by observing his actions, and by examining how his Apostles understood and explained his meaning, by applying it to several cases, both of individuals and collective bodies, which fell out after his death, and during their inspiration; and perceiving the truth and beauty of all this, and finding a satisfaction in it calming his mind and producing in him a pleasure never experienced before, he will become a convert to the Christian religion, and choose to make the truths of it the rules of his action, and the ground of his hope. This man is led step by step to a moment in life, in which he becomes a new man, rises, as it were, from the dead into "newness of life," and when he makes his appearance among Christians, the question will naturally be asked, "Who hath begotten me his man? Who hath brought up this man? Where hath he been? Christians, come round this man and inquire: "he is of age, ask him, he shall speak for himself." By whose direction did you come into this Christian assembly? His answer is, Jesus Christ informed me that "where two or three are gathered together in his name, there" is he "in the midst of them;" and "that if two" of his disciples "shall agree on earth as touching any thing they shall ask, it shall be done for them of" his Father "which is in heaven." I come to join with you in worshipping God; and to be instructed by you who have studied religion longer than I have, in the truths contained in the Holy Scriptures. Ask him again, How came you an Englishman born near two thousand years after Christ, a Jew who lived and died in the eastern part of the world,—how came you acquainted with Jesus Christ? His answer is, I have been lately reading his history, written by those who had "heard and seen what they declared," and who "wrote unto us that we also might have fellowship with them, and their fellowship was truly with the Father

and with his Son Jesus Christ." Think it not presumption in me, a Gentile, to appropriate to myself all the benefits of a religion, which, though preached first to the Jews, was, "according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known unto all nations for the obedience of faith." This is "made manifest to me by the Scriptures of the Prophets," and in finding Christ, "I have found him of whom Moses in the law and the Prophets did write;" and the whole seemed to me as clear as the day light, and as free as the air. Ask further, How came you to believe the truth of all this? He replies, I could not withhold my assent any more than I can help being warmed by approaching a fire. The evidences of the truth of the Gospel stood before me; I seemed to myself surrounded with Prophets and Apostles: nobody asked any favor of me, they all bore witness to the truth of one fact, and I could not help yielding to the force of evidence. Ask him once more: This fact subverts the whole order of your former course of living; how came you to examine a religion so utterly destructive of all your former sinful enjoyments? He tells you: "I was stript of all the pleasure of living by a death in my family, which, though I can never cease to lament, I am obliged to confess seems to me now necessary to rouse me out of that dead sleep of sin in which I lay. It seems a severe part of the government of God, but necessary to a man in my condition; and I consider it now as the language of one, whose absolute right to dispose of me empowered him to say, when he struck the blow, "Awake thou that sleepest, arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." Once more, inquire how an event, which some scarcely feel, made him so very unhappy? He will go out of religion into a thousand subjects, as the accomplishments of his partner, the tenderness of his own feelings, and other articles of a like kind, all which traced back, will at last appear to have God for their first cause. This man hath always been a child asleep in the bosom of his Father, and when he woke he found himself in his arms. Call in now all the means used to "lead" this man to the spot where he now is, and examine which of them made this man a Christian. Was it any one of your Prophets or Apostles? We brought, indeed, "the message which we heard of God, and declared" unto him; but we were not acquainted with him till lately; he had, when we found him, eyes to read, ears to hear, and understanding to judge, a conscience to reprove, and he was in a condition neither melancholy nor mad, but disposed to make use of them. In a word; there is a chain of events, one of which brings on another, and of all which God is the first cause, and if you can suppose the life of the man just now mentioned to consist of a chain of five thousand events, and that three thousand and fifty came to pass before he touched the Holy Scriptures, and that his reading them was the three thousand and fifty-first event, I should call three thousand and fifty, acts of God as the God of nature; the three thousand and fifty-first an act of God as the God of grace; and though I should think him "led" all along before by the same God, yet I should from that moment date his being "led by the Spirit of God" as a Spirit of truth and holiness, revealing himself in Scripture as the Saviour of sinners, and in no other way."

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. II.*

WE had fully intended to republish all the essays of *Archippus* on the question of Gentile Baptism not for the Remission of Sins; but, by some fatality, the numbers of the "*Christian Messenger*," containing his 2d and 3d essays, have been mislaid, and we can only for the present cite from our recollections. We have written for a copy of these numbers, and if we have omitted any of his strong points we shall notice them hereafter.

His strongest argument, and, indeed, his only argument that has any plausibility, is, that "the first Gentile congregation addressed by Peter, were not commanded to be immersed for the remission of sins,

"but that the Holy Spirit fell upon them before they were immersed; and that they were afterwards reported, Acts xv. to have had their hearts purified by faith." From which he infers that they were pardoned through faith previous to immersion. This is, we think, a fair statement of his main argument. With seeming confidence in the irrefragable strength of his position, he asks, "Can we suppose that those persons on whom the Holy Spirit fell were yet in their sins? and certainly they received the Holy Spirit before they were immersed—consequently, while in their sins."

It is always expedient, as well as lawful, to have the whole strength of an argument or objection presented before an attempt is made to meet or repel it. Having in the above the full strength, as we conceive, of the argument in favor of immersion after remission, or immersion not for the answer of a good conscience, or not for the remission of sins, we shall devote a few periods to its examination.

In the first place it will be conceded by Archippus himself, that the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on the house of Cornelius, were those gifts now called *miraculous;* such as the gift of speaking foreign languages, or the gift of interpreting, prophesying, &c. This being conceded, it will follow that if these gifts were bestowed at any time upon persons without regard to a change of state, or character, or to purity of heart, it can prove nothing in favor of the remission of the sins of these Gentiles before immersion. As he makes the reception of these gifts a proof of their remission before immersion, it is essential to the truth and validity of his argument that he prove that these gifts were never bestowed upon persons who were not pardoned. But this he cannot prove; for something like the contrary can be proved, and this at once makes his reasoning fallacious and inconclusive. For so long as it is written that the Spirit of God fell upon Saul, (1 Sam. x. 10.) and that Balaam prophesied, and that Judas had all the spiritual gifts which were possessed by the Apostles previous to the ascension of the Saviour; and that persons have wrought miracles in the name of Jesus; and have tasted the powers of the world to come, who were not pardoned, but died in their sins—his argument, drawn from the gift of tongues bestowed on the Pagans in the house of Cornelius, is illogical and fallacious. There is nothing pardoning or purifying in such gifts. Even the *Christians* in Corinth, who were foremost in the possession of them, were, in the estimation of Paul, *carnal, and walked as men.* They even envied one another because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit which they possessed, and had not prudence to use them for the purposes for which they were bestowed. The gifts bestowed on these Gentiles were for *a sign;* and so Peter always used them when speaking in vindication of himself to his Jewish brethren. This immersion in the Holy Spirit, as Peter explained it, was bestowed on the Gentiles as it had been on the Jews. The Spirit confirmed the testimony to Jews and Gentiles at its first promulgation by the same operations. This is the legitimate use of this incident; and its falling upon the Gentiles, so soon as *remission of sins by the name of Jesus was announced, was intended to confirm*

that statement; and, therefore, as soon as Peter recovered from the panic of this interruption of his discourse, he *commanded their immersion by the authority of the Lord.*

Archippus, it appears, mistakes the meaning of this incident altogether. The Jews on Pentecost, the Gentiles on their first calling, and the Samaritans were not received into the kingdom of Jesus exactly in the same manner, for reasons which might, perhaps, be discovered.

The Samaritans heard, believed, and were immersed before they received any one of these gifts of the Holy Spirit. When the Apostles in Jerusalem heard that the Samaritans believed and were immersed, they sent Peter and John to lay hands upon them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Their former standing, and their controversy with the Jews, perhaps, required this peculiarity in the economy of Heaven towards them. At all events, they did not receive the Holy Spirit either as the Jews or Gentiles at the beginning, but by *the intervention of the hands of Jews*, whom they had nationally and unrighteously opposed. As well might Archippus urge this case to prove that men might believe and be immersed and brought into the kingdom of Jesus without the Holy Spirit and without pardon, as to apply that incident in the house of Cornelius to prove that they were pardoned before they were immersed.

But this is not all: his own argument can be retorted upon himself with all the factitious force he has given it. Can it be possible, one might say to him, that Cornelius, so good a man, so pious, so benevolent, so charitable, who gave much alms to the people, and continually prayed to God, was in an *unsaved, unpardoned state*, before Peter came "*to tell him words by which himself and his house might be saved!*" Yet this must be admitted because an angel said so, (Acts xi. 14.) But had he not been so informed, I doubt not but the same ingenuity which discovered that Cornelius and his household were pardoned before they were immersed, would have *proved* that he was *saved* before Peter announced the gospel to him!!

Having disposed of this part of the argument, we proceed to notice another saying on which our friend Archippus relies with much assurance. The Gentiles had been purified in their hearts by faith. A very slight attention to the words in connexion with which these stand might have shown our friend that this saying proves too much for him, for it proves that the Jews as well as the Gentiles were saved by the same grace and purified by the same faith. If he maintain his ground here, it must be at the expense of his identifying both the immersion on Pentecost and that of Cornelius, which subverts the distinction he would fain introduce between Jewish and Gentile baptism. But how does it read? "And God who knows the heart, bare witness to them, (the Gentiles,) giving them the Holy Spirit, *even as he did to us, and made no distinction between us and them*, having purified their hearts by faith." So, then, God made no such distinction between the meaning of immersion to a Jew and to a Gentile, as my friend Archippus would make. He did not command the Jews to be immersed for the

remission of their sins, and the Gentiles to be immersed because their sins were forgiven. He purified the hearts of both Jews and Gentiles by faith. Alas! how shortsighted are they who oppose the truth! Did Archippus think that either grace, blood, water, or obedience can purify the heart of man without faith? Neither the grace of God, nor the blood of Jesus, nor the institution of immersion, nor obedience can purify the heart of man without faith. Faith is that principle which brings us nigh, or under, that influence which saves us. Neither can faith without blood, nor faith without grace, save or purify the heart or soul of man. And he who relies upon faith for pardon, without grace, blood, water, and obedience to every divine institution, relies upon a foundation which imagination, and neither reason nor revelation has laid.

Because faith is that principle in us which realizes, apprehends, and embraces the whole christian institution, it is of all other principles, natural or acquired, the most deserving to stand first, and to have the salvation of men ascribed to it. And so it generally stands first, because, in our order of things, it is the first. But, in God's order, it is the third. In the order of things as respects him, it is first grace; second, the sacrifice, or blood of Jesus; third, faith; and fourth, reformation, or obedience. As respects our arrangement of things, it is first faith; then the blood of Jesus; then the grace of God; then obedience. To explain: Obedience springs from faith; faith regards the blood of Jesus; and then the grace from which it flowed. But we are said to be "justified by faith," "justified by grace," "justified by his blood," "justified by works," and "saved by water." We stand up for them all; but every one in its own order. And if our friend Archippus has found out a new way for the Gentiles, in which they have only four steps, while the Jew has five, he must be honored by all the Gentile world. Hence the Gentile part of the Baptist population will thank him for nullifying immersion and for giving to faith all that is ascribed to both grace, blood, water, and obedience. But this must suffice for the present. We shall still farther expose the inadvertencies of our good friend Archippus.

EDITOR.

THE CO-OPERATION OF CHURCHES—*No. I.*

ARE christians to use any means to reform the world? And if they ought, what should they be? These are questions which deserve a very profound and serious consideration, because the decision of them must directly influence the practice of every disciple, and on a subject of paramount importance to the whole community. Philanthropy is the principle from which salvation flowed, and this is the principle which it imparts to all who are reconciled to God. Hence every christian desires the reformation and salvation of men. And surely the religion of Jesus Christ imparts no principle of action which ought not to be obeyed; no desire, which ought not to be gratified.

But has the Lord committed the salvation of men to the agency of his spirit, or to the agency of man, or to both united? Not to the agency of his spirit alone, else men ought not to speak, or pray, or think for the salvation of men. Nor has he committed it to the agency of angels, for none are now employed to preach the gospel. Nor to the agency of the word alone, else christians in that word would not be commanded to endeavor to save themselves and others from the wrath to come, or to win others over to the gospel by their good behavior.

We need not labor to prove a point which, if not universally admitted, is admitted by almost every person who has assumed the christian name. If Jesus Christ had contemplated the salvation of men by his spirit, or by angels, he would not have employed any human agents or human means either in the commencement or in the prosecution of this great and glorious undertaking. He has now left it to the church to convert the world. He gave Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers, supernaturally qualified for this work after his ascension. They were to announce *the word of life*, the gospel of salvation, and to fit the disciples for carrying on this work in all time coming. These have long since died; but by the means which they set on foot, corrupted and impeded as they have been by mistaken and designing men, the gospel has reached us, and we are now sitting in the kingdom of heaven by the operation of those means, which the Author of this religion originated.

Greatly, indeed, have these means been corrupted and perverted; yet, through them we are now rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God to be revealed at the resurrection of the just. But the abuse of any means is no argument against the use of them. The tongue and the hand of man have effected all the moral wonders of the world. Speech addressed to the ear by the human voice, and words addressed to the eye by the human hand, whether of the scribe or of him who pulls the press, have achieved much for the natural, political, and moral good of man. The tongue and the pen, puny instruments indeed, have been, and still are, the great moral levers of the world. Sustained by a virtuous and religious life, they are the most omnipotent instruments with which a human agent can be furnished. Without them man is impotent indeed. "A wholesome tongue is a tree of life;" for, "death and life are in the power of the tongue," as Solomon affirms. All the moral power of man is in his tongue; "and where the word of a king is there is power." As the world was created by the word of God, it will be redeemed by the word of his Son; "And this is that word which as glad tidings has been announced to us." But the question is, How is the church to use this word for the conversion of the world?

Christian parents are to teach it to their children. "Parents bring up your children in the nurture and correction of the Lord." In the public meetings of the brethren it is read and proclaimed, in all their worship, in the social institutions of christianity. When this is done have christians done all they can do, and all they ought to do for the

reformation and salvation of the world? Few will answer yes; for they know that more can yet be done. Many who frequent not the meetings of the christian congregations; many who are brought up in families where the fear of God is not taught, still remain objects of christian commisseration and enterprize. Every christian, in his intercourse with these, will do all he can to imbue their minds with the doctrine of God our Saviour.

But a question arises, Does not society, as now constituted, require still greater exertions than these: and ought not christians to select such agents as can have the greatest influence in converting men, and employ them for that purpose?

To employ men to preach the gospel in a christian congregation is a satire upon that congregation which employs them. But if it be the duty of every christian, in his individual character and capacity, to proclaim the word to those ignorant of it, and to publish the excellencies of Him who has called him out of darkness into his marvellous light, it is the duty of the whole congregation, as circumstances may require, and their opportunities permit, to put forth all their talents and enterprize for the conversion of those without, or for the reformation and salvation of the world.

But then it will be asked, How is this to be done without falling into the vices and abuses of the sectarian world? Every thing, it is admitted, can be abused. The Author of the christian religion himself could not, because he did not, introduce a system of things incapable of abuse. But this is a very different economy from that of the popular institutions of the sects. This contemplates the placing of every christian congregation directly and exclusively under the tuition of the Apostles, and recognizes every disciple as one of the Lord's freedmen and priests. This regards them as a worshipping assembly, and not as the auditors of a religious lecturer or sermonizer, whose chief duty it is to meet and hear a sermon or a lecture, and to pay the preacher so much per annum for his orations. This respects them as having full power or privilege to attend upon every part of the christian institution without any distinct class of priests, Levites, ministers, or clergy. It only provides for the reformation of those without, or for the gathering of disciples out of the world into such a relation and institution as will place them also distinctly under the government of Jesus Christ and the Apostles. In achieving this, it will require the co-operation of the brotherhood not only of one congregation, but sometimes of more than one congregation; nay, of all the congregations in a given district. In other words it will require, on some occasions, all the talents, all the means possessed by all the disciples in a given district, to wage a successful war against infidelity, atheism, sensuality, and all that leads men captive to destruction. That it is the duty of churches to co-operate in every thing beyond the individual achievements of a particular congregation, we shall now attempt to illustrate and sustain.

A church can do what an individual disciple cannot, and so can a district of churches do what a single congregation cannot. But al

though reason and the nature of things make this apparent, it must pass for nothing as respects the conscience, if we cannot show that in the apostolic churches such co-operation existed, and that it was a part of the means adopted by the authority of the Lord for the furtherance of the gospel. This we hope to make very apparent in stating and illustrating a few propositions:

1. The churches were *districted* in the age of the Apostles.

This is evident from the classifications so frequently mentioned in the Epistles. For example: "The churches of Galatia," mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 1. "The churches of Macedonia," mentioned 2 Cor. viii. 1. "The churches of Judea," named Gal. i. 22. "The churches of Asia," spoken of 1 Cor. xvi. 19. That they were so districted with a reference to some object, or for some cause, must be obvious. The question now is, For what cause were they so districted? This we answer in the form of a separate proposition—

2. The churches planted in those districts of country, because of some local and discriminating interest, as well as because of their co-operation for certain specified purposes, were denominated from the districts of country in which they lived.

That churches of certain districts had peculiar interests, arising from their own peculiar circumstances, is evinced on sundry occasions. Hence all the churches of the Gentiles gave thanks to Priscilla and Aquila, because they hazarded their lives to save the life of Paul. The *Gentile* churches show, in this their deep interest in Paul, because he was their Apostle.

Particular districts also, co-operated in contributing to the necessities of those who lived in another district of country, because of some consideration which called forth their peculiar energies, made it their duty more than others' to assist them. Hence Paul "gave orders to all the churches in Galatia," and to some if not all "in Achaia," to make collections and contributions for the suffering poor in "the churches of Judea." But that which most immediately bears upon the object in view is expressed in the following proposition—

3. The primitive churches in certain districts did co-operate in *choosing* certain persons for the work of the Lord, and these persons when chosen were called the "*Messengers of the Churches.*"

We are expressly told, 2 Cor. viii. 19. that a certain person was chosen by the churches to accompany the Apostles in ministering to the saints; and that persons so chosen were *messengers of the churches*, who co-operated in employing them for certain purposes. This is all that is necessary to our present purpose. It is now shown from the authoritative book that the ancient churches did, in certain districts, unite in *choosing* and *appointing* certain persons for religious purposes —and that these persons, *chosen by the churches* of any district, were *the messengers of the churches* of that district. All that we infer from this, is, that we have good authority, when occasion requires, to go and do likewise. But of this more in our next.

EDITOR.

TIMOTHY DWIGHTS' TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF *INTO*

MUCH has been said against us for rendering, on our own responsibility, the command authorizing immersion *into* instead of *in* the name. We always immerse *in* water *into the name*, &c. We have been denounced for this by all parties, and by none more than by the Baptists and Presbyterians; yet there can be nothing more plain in language, nor evident in fact, than that immersing *in* the name is not the action which Christ commanded. We found, the other day, that we had the greatest name in America on our side of the question. I need not say a word to Presbyterians nor Baptists of reading in commendation of Timothy Dwight, S. T. D. L. L. D. President of Yale. He exactly concurs with us in this matter, and argues from the same premises. Hear him:—

ED. M. H.

"All persons are baptized, not *in*, but *into*, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; that is, they are in this ordinance publicly and solemnly introduced into the family, and entitled in a peculiar manner to the name, of God. Accordingly they are called *Godly; Christians; Spiritual*; *Sons and Daughters of God; and Children of God;* throughout the Scriptures. That this is the true construction of the passage just quoted, is, I think, obvious from the Greek phraseology, *eis to onoma*, the proper English of which is, *into the name.* Accordingly it is customarily rendered in this manner by the translators of our Bible in those passages where the same subject is mentioned. Thus, Rom. vi. 3. 4. St. Paul asks, *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized* INTO *Jesus Christ, were baptized* INTO *his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism* INTO *death.* 1 Cor. xii. 13. *For by one Spirit we were all baptized* INTO *one body.* Gal. iii. 27. *As many of you as have been baptized* INTO *Christ, have put on Christ.* In all these instances the phraseology is the same with that first quoted; and, from analogy, teaches us, that it ought, there also, to have been rendered in the same manner: *into*, being the original and proper meaning of the preposition; and *in*, being a meaning so uncommon, as heretofore to have been resolved into a *Hebraism.* Several passages, also, directly declare that those who are baptized are baptized into Christ; that is, into the church, or body of Christ."

[*Vol.* iv. *p.* 318.]

RECEIPTS

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

L Luy, New Lisbon O. paid vols 1 & 2—J J Moss, Beaver Pa. pd vols 1 & 2—S Cox, Bethany Va. pd vol 2—F V Sutton, White Chimnies, Va. pd vol 2 for R Pare, M Jones, D Deyarnet, C Todd, and vol 1 for J T Sutton—J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store Va. pd vol 2 for D F Hatchett, J Dowdy, T M Knight, S Shelbourn, and P Barnes—T J Murdock, Burlington Ky. pd vol 1 for J Waltern, and vol 2 for J Stevens and himself—J B Hull, Charlottesville Va. pd vols 1 & 2—J D Barker, Maysville Ky. pd vol 1 for E Robertson and vol 2

for T C Osborn—J T Johnson, Georgetown Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for T F Johnson, and vol 2 for M A Feris—J Rogers, Carlisle, Ky. pd vol 1 for J Hall, and vol 2 for J West—D Arnold, Steubenville, O. pd vol 2—J Hodgens, West-Middletown, Pa. pd vols 1 & 2—T Webb, White's Store S. C. pd vol 1—D Blosser, Luray Va. pd vol 1 for B Carder and himself—J Platenburg, Wheeling Va. pd vol 2 for J Allen—J T Johnson, Georgetown, Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for A Shotwell—F V Sutton, White Chimnies Va. vol 2 for H Coleman and himself—C King, Irville O. pd vol 2—R Simmons, Salem Tenn. pd vol 2—J L Rhees, Philadelphia Pa. pd vol 1 for B R Rhees, W Ballantine, F Plummer, J Simmons; J Chambers, J Watson, C Plummer, Mrs Porter, R Mingus, J Heazlett, J Patterson, B White, and three copies for himself—B Allen, Brownsboro Ky. pd vol 1 for J Shrader, T Miller, and vols 1 and 2 for H Puryear, and vol 2 for G W Jeffries—S Stone, Mecklenburg Va. pd vol 2—S Earl, Earle's Store S. C. pd vol 1 for S Smith, and vol 2 for W Prothro and J G Harrison—E A Smith, Danville Ky. some time since, pd vol 1 for J Mahan, which was omitted in the receipts—D Hughes, Old Court House Mi. pd vols 1 & 2 for D Chambers, and vol 1 for S W Wells, T Kell, and J Cameron—W D Jourdan, Locust Shade Tenn. pd vol 1 for W Overstreet, V Gearhart, and W Huddleston—P Noland, Rodney Mi. pd vols 1 & 2 for W Griffing, and vol 2 for himself—F V Sutton, White Chimnies Va. pd vol 2 for T Hurt and B B Wright—J D Barker, Maysville Ky. pd vol 2 for H White, E Robertson, J Walton, and W Corwine—J Jones, Liberty K. pd vol 1 for G Sweney and W Wilkinson—J B Edwards, King William Court House Va pd vols 1 & 2 for C Lipscomb and G Mill, and vol 2 for S Lipscomb. A Edwards, P Johnson, and J C Edwards—A Adams, Haydensville Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for S Hill, and $1 vol 1 for M Grubbs—D C Babbit. Warren O. pd vol 1 for C Bosworth—J N Smith, Athens Al. pd vol 1 for E H Nixons and H G Fellows—B S Hendrickson, New York City, pd vol 1 for G Sharp, and $1 for vol 2 for M Young—S C Dunning, Savannah Gn. pd vol 2 for D Liegan. C Wissembaker, A G. Richards. C Dasher, T Y Lee, J C Habershaw, S C Dunning, J Hilveston, A Marshall, Mr Harman, T Clark, J Gardner, H A Bird, O Wood, Mrs Love, and vol 1 for S B Williams and R Cooper—J Dubois, Fairfield Ia. pd vols 1 & 2—J R Price, Schuylkill Pa. pd vols 1 & 2—A Reynolds, Dripping Spring Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for J Hendrick, and $1 for vol 1 for J B Reynolds—A Potter, Bennington O. pd vol 2—M Martin, Salem Ia. pd vol 2 for D Denny, R Denny, and himself—J T Jones, Cincinnati O. pd vol 2 for W Montague, J G Burnet, J Watkins, Maria Richardson, N Price, J Sparks, W Snodgrass, J M'Cash, Mary Eversole, and W A Nelson—T J Morris, Bethel O. pd vol 2 for J Tingley—G W Elley, Nicholasville Ky. pd vol 1 for J Allen and W Steel—T M Henley, Loyds Va. pd vol 2 for W Harrison, A Rennolds, L Boulware, and vols 1 & 2 for R Boulware—W D Jourdan, Locust Shade Tenn. pd vol 1 for J Overstreet and W Harrison—J T Johnson, Georgetown pd vols 1 & 2 for himself, and $1 for vol 2 for D Bradford—M Martin, Salem Ia. pd vols 1 & 2 for J Martin, and vol 2 for E Denny and J Trowbridge—E McGehee, Sandy River Church Va. pd vol 2 for T McCraw, W C Ligan, and $1 for J Schofield—G White, Alexandria D. C. pd vols 1 & 2—H Elley, Westport Ky. pd vol 2 for W Wells and himself—J B Radford, Hopkinsville, Ky. pd vol 1 for N Hester, and vol 2 for A Titterington, and $1 for vol 2 for P Allensworth—A Littell, Charlestown Ia. vol 1 for B Gibson and E T Osman, and $1 for vol 2 for T Littell—L Page, Russelville Ky. pd vols 1 & 2 for J McCurdy, and vol 2 for W Owens, W Hogan, M Hogan, E Trabue, S Fuqua, J L Page, and G H Brown—A Dyke, Royalton O. pd vol 1—D S Burnet, Dayton O. pd vol 2 I B Stanford, New York pd vol 2—J Terneur, Skaneatlas N. Y. pd vol 2—D King, pd vols 1 & 2; E Singleton, vol 1; S Church, vol 1 & 2; Mrs Forrester, vol 2; — Wright, vol 2; B Pyatt, vol 1; Andrew Wolf, vol 2: all of Pittsburgh Pa.—A Sturdevant, pd vol 1, J D Wolf, vol 2 Ravenna O.—E Hubbard Deerfield O. pd vol 2—Wm Hayden, pd vol 2 for S Edwards, Palmyra—Sa'l Hayden and J Cotten pd vol 2.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 6. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1831.* Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

CO-OPERATION OF CHURCHES.—*No. II.*

WE shall prove and illustrate the following proposition, viz. *The first churches did exercise the right of selecting from among themselves brethren for the accomplishment of special purposes.* Let me define this proposition: By *special purposes* I do not mean every and any purpose—*e. g.* I dont mean political purposes; nor literary ones, as such, nor commercial ones—I mean ecclesiastical purposes—matters which regard the conversion of the world and the welfare of the churches. For the accomplishing of these matters, then, I say the primitive churches did exercise the right of selecting brethren.

But to approach the proof of this position gradually, and in order to be fairly understood, I would just observe that when our Lord Jesus had any special business on hand, he uniformly effected it by the agency of special messengers. For instance, when he required a piece of money, he sent Peter to the lake; when the Jewish nation required to be informed of the approach of the Messiah's reign, Jesus sent forth the *twelve*, and afterwards *seventy disciples*, to proclaim in every place whither he himself should come. When he wished to have a colt for his public entry into the Jewish capital he sent two of his servants on this special business; and when he displayed his glory on the Holy Mount, he chose as special witnesses Peter, James, and John

The Apostles also acted in this way, and accomplished their great purposes by select brethren—*e. g.* When they heard that Samaria had received the word, they sent Peter and James to lay their hands on the disciples that they might "receive the Holy Spirit." The Apostles also sent Barnabas to Antioch to see what was going on there; and when he had arrived and had seen the grace of God, he tarried with them some time, and much people were added unto the Lord; for he was a good man and full of faith. The Apostles and the church of Jerusalem in conjunction sent letters to the churches of the Gentiles on the special question of *circumcision*, and also selected Judas and Silas to relate the same things by word of mouth. The Apostles also selected individuals for the effecting of evangelical or gospel purposes, and styled them *Evangelists*. Paul on one occasion chose Silas, and

Barnabas chose John Mark; afterwards Paul chose Timothy on the recommendations of the brethren of Derbe, &c. &c.

Having thus stated, defined, and illustrated the proposition, I now advance to the proof that the primitive churches did exercise the right of selecting from among themselves brethren for the accomplishment of all special purposes.

When the church of Jerusalem wanted people to attend tables, they chose seven, and set them over this business. When the church of Antioch determined to aid the poor saints in the Jewish capital, they sent their contribution by the hands of special messengers, Barnabas and Paul; and when the matter of circumcision had to be determined, these two champions were sent for the judgment of the Apostles to Jerusalem. The church of Philippi sent Epaphroditus to Paul, and the same people had formerly sent once and again to him while in Thessalonica, and in Revelations the seven messengers which came from the Asiatic churches to John in Patmos, were returned with letters from Jesus to their respective institutions at Ephesus, Smyrna, &c. &c. Besides these and many other instances which could be adduced of single churches despatching their business by the agency of chosen men among the brethren, we have several instances of a number of churches in the same district concurring in the election of individuals to do special business—*e. g.* In 2 Cor. chap. viii. the Apostle speaks of a person whose praise was in the gospel through all the congregations; and not only this, but "who," says he, "was chosen by the congregations to travel with us," &c. Paul himself was chosen of the Macedonians to carry their contribution to Jerusalem, and he speaks of men who were the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ. And let it be observed that the choice of the brethren was over-ruled by the Apostles; for then it would not have been their choice. The Apostles said, "Look you out from among yourselves seven men." It does not read, 'We will look out seven men;' nor 'Look out seven men whom we shall name.' Again, Paul says, (1 Cor. chap. xvi.) "And when I come, whomsoever you shall approve by letters, them I will send to carry your gift to Jerusalem." The brethren, then, of any individual church, and the churches of any individual district, did, as we see, enjoy the right, and did exercise the liberty of concurring in the free and uncontrolled election of chosen men from among themselves for the accomplishment of special purposes—*i. e.* evangelical purposes.

Having thus stated, defined, illustrated, and proved our proposition, we now hold ourselves in readiness to defend it against all oppugners; and conclude by saying that the circumstances of the church at this time call imperiously for the application of this principle, or right, for the accomplishment of some of the most important purposes for which the church herself was set up in the world; but now-a-days our apprehensions of co-operation are so exceedingly morbid, that the brethren of an individual church would almost leave wholly undone the most important duties for fear of sinning in the choice of brethren to discharge them.

PHILIP.

CO-OPERATION OF CHURCHES.—*No. III.*

ALL the business of a church is either *internal* or *external*—*i. e.* her duties either respect those who are *within* or those who are *without*—the *world* or the *brethren*—the *converted* or *unconverted*. What has she to do for those who are *within?* She has to teach them all things whatsoever Jesus commanded the Apostles. But can she do this in her public and congregated capacity in any way but by means of her individual members, fitted by time, talent, and acquirement? No—certainly no! As well might we talk of the human body doing a thing without the agency of its particular members, as of the church effecting any thing without the aid and agency of individual disciples. We say the human body sees, but do we mean the whole body sees? No, a man does not see with the back of his head. When we say the body sees, we certainly mean that it sees with its eyes. Does it hear? Then the ear is employed. Does it feed itself? Then the hand is used? Does it speak? Then the mouth is opened. Is it otherwise in the body of Christ? Is all eye here? all ear—all mouth? No—the church can neither break bread, pray, read, nor even have her meetings opened and closed for public worship, but by the interference of individuals selected for these purposes. If, then, she cannot teach nor worship without her individual members, neither can she preach without their aid.

To *teach* and to *preach* became the two most important duties of the church when the Apostles left the world. Yes, these high matters, as will be seen immediately, ultimately devolved upon the church; and though, perhaps, it cannot be said of any individual member, 'Wo unto him if he does not preach the gospel:' yet, in all fairness it may be said of the church, 'Wo unto her if she preach not the gospel!' for if she do not, who shall? Will angels? Will wicked or worldly men do it? Will demons do it? No, the *church* must do it. And how will she do it? By her individual members, qualified within her own bosom for this high purpose. How important, then, the proposition developed in our last essay, viz. "that the churches exercised the right of selecting individual members for special business." We shall now introduce a second proposition for illustration and proof, viz. *That to teach and to preach are strictly and properly duties of the church.* I dont mean to preach every thing and any thing. For example, I dont mean politics, nor philosophy natural or moral—I dont even mean what is called the gospel—I mean the gospel itself as Christ preached it as the Apostles preached it, as the Evangelists preached it, both in matter and form—I mean that the church must have proclaimed to men in the flesh the same facts in the same words which the Evangelists, Apostles, and Jesus employed. The Apostle speaks of the form of sound words, and of speaking spiritual things in words dictated by the Spirit. A multitude of things depend wholly on their form—*i. e.* destroy the form, and you destroy the thing itself; destroy the form of a bowl, and you destroy the bowl itself. The gospel, too, may be destroyed by breaking up the form of sound words by which the facts of which it is composed were handed to the churches by the Spirit in the

Holy Scriptures. The churches, then, must have the gospel preached to their fellow-men in substance, and in words as the Scriptures direct; for if she does not preach, how shall she increase her members? and if she does not have teaching, how will her converts grow in knowledge? It is one thing to conquer a country, and another to maintain that conquest; it is one thing to obtain a family, and another to sustain that family.

During his life it was the great business of our Lord Jesus Christ to *preach* and to *teach*. He first made disciples, and then taught them. The Sermon on the Mount was a lesson to his disciples. Matth. chap. v. "Jesus seeing so great a confluence, repaired to a mountain, and having sat down his disciples came to him. Then breaking silence, he taught them, saying, Happy the poor," &c. The forty days which elapsed between his resurrection and ascension were employed by him in teaching the Apostles the things which related to the kingdom of God; and when he was taken up into heaven from the business of *preaching* and *teaching* devolved immediately upon the Twelve. They were charged with three important duties in the following words: "Go, convert all the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *teaching* them to do all the things which I have commanded you," &c. Accordingly they went every where preaching the word; and it is said in Acts they ceased not to *teach* and to *preach* Jesus Christ. The Apostles soon found it necessary to associate with themselves in these great matters other men; some of them styled Evangelists, others Pastors, Teachers, Bishops, &c. So that in some instances we have a picture of the Apostle Paul, pretty much resembling a great military chief standing in the midst of his aids, surrounded with Timothy, Titus, Erastus, Silas, Mark, Zenas, Apollos, Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Tychicus, Trophimus, Epaphroditus, Luke, Eubulus, fellow-prisoners and fellow-laborers, messengers of the churches some of them, and the very boast of the Christian religion.

But now Jesus and the Apostles have left the field; on whom, then, devolves the duty of teaching and preaching but the church? There is no other institution on earth to attend to these matters. It was first the business of our blessed Lord; then it became the duty of the Apostles, and finally it was entrusted to the divine institution called the congregation, the body of Christ, the church of the living God.

Having stated, defined, and illustrated this second proposition, I shall now prove it by references and quotations. Does not the Apostle address one of his letters to the church at Philippi, with the *Bishops* and Deacons? Does he not recognize the existence of men in the churches of Galatia, whose peculiar province it was to teach and to be made partakers of all good things in return? Does he not say that a Bishop should be apt to teach? Elders are enjoined to feed the flock of God; and he who taught was ordered to attend upon his teaching. Finally, the Apostle mentions certain of the elders who labored in *word* and teaching. The *word* means the gospel, as every well instructed disciple knows; and if we substitute the definition for

the term itself, then the passage in Timothy will read thus: "Let the elders who preside well be accounted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in *preaching* and *teaching;* for it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." Is not the Church then contemplated in these scriptures as an institution in which the great duties of teaching and preaching were sustained? Undoubtedly. "The work of the Lord" is a phrase which occurs in the New Testament. "He worketh the work of the Lord," says the Apostle. Now what is this work of the Lord but that which Jesus attended to when he was on the earth, viz. teaching and preaching. This we have seen was his work, and he left it to the Apostles as long as they should live. "Separate unto me Paul and Barnabas, for the *work* whereunto I have called them:" again, "he went not with us to the *work*:" again, "For the *work* of Christ, he was nigh unto death." Hear then we see that Christ has a work to be done on earth, nor can the Church be released from the duty of having it done, until the world be filled with the knowledge of the Lord. Have politicians their work to be carried on? so has the Lord. Have the carpenters, smiths, merchants, artists, their work to be attended to? so has the Lord his work to be attended to. And alas! for that person called Christian, and that Church which has assumed the name of Christ, and suffers the name of the Lord to languish and to lay unheeded by carelessness and the love of this world. Notwithstanding all that has been said and written on the subject of scripture plainness, both in reference to the gospel and to every other matter, I shall hazzard one saying about the Bible, which I should like to see some folks with all their extent of reason and intellect, attempt to disprove. It is as follows, that, "The scriptures begin with the simplest, and end with the most profound book that is to be read in any language." I grant, that to him that understandeth, every thing is plain, but individuals carry things too far. "*Est modus in rebus*," said the Roman Poet, and reason should obtain, in regard to the plainness and obscurity of the different parts of the Bible, as well as of any other book.—Some would have the world to be converted by the order of the Church! Did you ever read in the Bible that faith came by order—public order? never. Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; i. e. the gospel. The Church then must let the people hear the gospel, if she would have them to believe it; but who shall speak? who shall preach? Why, those of her sons who labor in word and doctrine—those of the disciples whom she has selected for this special purpose.

Men will smatter and chatter about the conversion of the world, who never brought a dozen to God in their lives, either by their preaching, or their order; and talk about the plainness of scripture, who have been twenty years in the congregation, and don't know a pin in the tabernacle; who could not tell whether Jachin or Boaz stood on the right side of the temple porch; who could no more tell the name of David's mother, than they could tell why so much was done in the work of the Lord by the Apostles, and so little by themselves. How

easy a thing it is for men to sit by their own fireside in the enjoyment of every domestic comfort, and slight the labors, and mar the good standing of those who dare every difficulty, that presses from a thousand points, upon him who would recuscitate the ancient gospel, and pour destruction upon the corruptions of the times. With what eagerness is every moiety of talent picked up and improved in the political world! How the artists gather around the sons of genius and of talent who appear among them! To what advantage may a modicum of taste be turned! either in poetry, sculpture, painting, or any of the fine arts! Truly the men of this world are in this respect wiser than the sons of light, as our great and glorious leader has observed. For when he presents them with servants, they not only don't use them for others' good, but will suspect the use of them for their own good.

The following fable would illustrate the conduct of some folks, who are better at speaking than practising Christianity:

Once upon a time the human body was in perfect good keeping with itself. The head, the trunk, and the extremities, honored and were obedient to one another; when all of a sudden the several other members broke faith with the mouth, and declared that how necessary soever that organ was to the support and defence of the body, it should henceforth receive no further support, but if it *would* employ its talents in speaking, and masticating the food, which right belonged to the stomach, it should perform these functions at its own expense. Orders therefore were immediately issued to the great aorta to interdict the passage of all nutriment to the mouth and its appurtenances, and one of the members in his zeal for the decision of the majority, and in order to set the thing aright, snapped the nerve of voluntary motion leading to the mouth, when all of a sudden, down dropped the chops to the terror and confusion of all who beheld it. "I have done the deed," said the member.

PHILIP

REGENERATION.—*No. VIII.*

NATURE and Revelation seem to have for their great object the development of the Divine character to man. Under the title of *the Two Witnesses* (spoken of in chap. xii. of the Book of the Revelations) they testify of God. Set forth, also, as the *Two Lamps* which stand before the God of the earth, they serve to expose the beauty of his countenance. Were these extinguished, in vain would we endeavor to discover Him. Amidst the night of ignorance which surrounds the human family, these are the only lights which dispel the gloom; and standing before the God of the earth, they are obviously intended to exhibit Him to the view of men.

Although during the apostacy, for twelve hundred and sixty years, these two witnesses prophesied in sackcloth, under the influence of *Sectarianism*, which has indeed thrown the veil of mysticism around them, and dimmed the brightness of the lamps; though the savage beast ATHEISM ascended from the abyss, and in denying the very

existence of God slew them, during the reign of terror in France, the street of the great city; though they had ceased to speak, yet they could not even then be concealed: the sun could not be hid, the verdant hills, the winding streams—nature could not be banished from the view of man—the Bible could not be annihilated. It is said, accordingly, that they were not buried; their corpses were exposed for three years and a half, (from 93½ to 97); then were they restored again, and stood upon their feet, while their enemies were terrified when they looked upon them. Then did they hear a voice, saying to them from Heaven, "Come up hither!" and since that period great has been their exaltation.

We formerly endeavored to show that the renovation of men depended upon the exhibition of God's character to them, and that God had revealed his character to man in a manner so simple and obvious as to enable all to study it, and to a degree so perfect as to compel the love of every one who allowed himself to contemplate it.

How great indeed is the influence of a knowledge of God's character upon that of man! How well did Satan succeed in debasing man by placing before him degrading exhibitions of the Divine Being! He being the standard of perfection, when that was lowered, when he was represented as no better than a creature, a Jupiter, an Osiris, an ox, a crocodile, man became immediately plunged into the lowest depths of degradation. And as man sinks, in proportion as he loses a knowledge of the true God, so is he elevated and improved, just as he becomes more intimately acquainted with him. Indeed, when we wish to know the character of a people, we have only to inquire that of their Divinity. Where his character is best known, there civilization is most advanced, and all the nobler principles of human nature more fully developed. And what is meant by the effect of the "reflex light of christianity," but that this institution, holding forth to the view of those among whom it has obtained a footing, as well by its precepts as by the lives of those who obey them, a perfect portrait of its Divine Author, has given to them the *best standard of perfection*, and by these means exerted a happy influence upon their character?

The various exhibitions of the Divine character have been precisely adapted to the circumstances of man at the time in which they were respectively made. Thus nature preceded revelation, and by the various images which she furnished afforded a means of conveying instruction orally. A language of symbols was then formed by means of which, from time to time, a more perfect knowledge of God was given to man, until finally being fully prepared to comprehend the full display of the excellency of his character, he beheld his beauty in the face of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world.

The glad tidings or testimony concerning Christ being the conclusion of the whole matter, and being presented to us, and approached only by means of every previous manifestation of God, forms, as it were, a point at which the glory of the divine character seems to concentre, and appears to have given the last shading to that portrait

which it required 4000 years to complete. All previous revelations, therefore, when they have already enabled us to understand the design and effects of the gospel, are not any longer to occupy our attention. As well might the scholar continue to dwell upon the alphabet and the primer, or the arithmetician upon the nine digits. When the painter has added those last touches to the picture which give beauty, design, and expression to all that he had previously sketched upon the canvass, we behold not the separate traces of his pencil—we admire the beauty of the likeness. When the bursting rose-bud unfolds its bright petals to the summer day, attracted by the glowing carmine we no longer occupy ourselves with the slender stalk which bears, or the oval leaves which have preceded the appearance of the queen of flowers—with the rose itself we are now entirely engrossed, and discover in it the perfect development of the beauty of the shrub.

The gospel of Christ, therefore, embracing a perfect exhibition of the divine character, is called the *seed* of which the children of God are born. When a man receives into his bosom, in the love of it, that image of God contained in the seed of the word, he is said to be begotten of God; and no sooner has he come forth from the womb of waters, than, taught to desire the unadulterated milk which is provided for his nourishment, he grows thereby, and as a child of God the goodness and excellencies of his Father begin by degrees to exhibit themselves to view. A creature entirely new is presented to us. New feelings, new principles, new actions, are displayed since he has become clothed with the new man who is created in righteousness and true holiness; and remembering that the old man was buried *in a figure*, he gradually acquires the mastery over him, and continues to resist his influence and to purify himself more and more until he is finally freed from the trammels of mortality.

DISCIPULUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE RELIGIOUS HERALD.

Dear Sir—I HAVE read your paper of the 6th of May, and from the slight acquaintance I have of you, as a man, a christian, and a christian teacher, I am truly mortified. I entertained a very different opinion of you before you became the Editor of the *Religious Herald*, from what I am now constrained to do. I can assure you it is a very unpleasant thing to me to enter into controversy with those whom I had reason to believe were good and useful men. Nothing but self-defence now urges me to notice your editorial remarks. It appears you have thrown down the gauntlet, and are resolved to destroy, or to render every one that *differs from you* as obnoxious to society as possible. Expressions contained in your remarks evidently were intended for those of your brethren that doubted *yours*, and the rest of your brethren's infallibility. You have become the assailant, and used language that does not justify one that dwells in a glass house—"pretended garb," "hypocrisy," "pretext," "false doctrines," "secretly sweeping away its very vitals," "it opposes all the great plans of Christian benevolence under the

pretence of being sectarian and mercenary," "some of the restless and speculative have gladly embraced any thing that could gratify their peculiar minds," "a few have weighed anchor, or rather cut their cable, because they *wished* to be out of an old harbor; but as they have ventured out without any *port in view*, they seem uncertain where they will land. Some of that number *appear* to be bending their course towards *Universalism*, some towards *Unitarianism*, and some towards *Rationalism*." "For there must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." 1 Cor. xi 19. "These are *manifestation years*." "It is now manifested who are to be carried about with every wind of doctrine, and who will continue rooted and grounded in the truth." Allow me, sir, just to take a passing notice of your *accusations* against Reformers, for to such I am bound to believe you allude.

Who is it that wears the "pretended garb?" They who believe and obey the written word of God, or those who claim to be *specially called and sent*, and can produce no more evidence of their call than his Holiness of Rome? They who pretend to be the only consecrated heads and hands that are authorized to minister at the altar; who make *lawless yokes* to bind the consciences of the disciples, and if they will not wear them cast them out of the congregation?

"*Hypocrisy*." Who are the hypocrites? They who present all their religious views in a tangible manner, coming directly from the language of inspiration? or those that make us believe they preach the gospel when they preach *themselves*, and *religion* instead of the gospel—profess to believe the word of God, and then make their *opinions a bond of union*, or paramount to the gospel—say call men Christians and will not fellowship them—profess to be God's ministers, and act like the sanguinary ruler of Portugal, who put his subjects to death *because they thought differently from him*," according to your own statement? If we are not put to death, we do not thank our opponents; they have done their best to destroy that which is dearer than life—rights of conscience.

"Pretext correcting the erroneous *doctrines* of the Priest, et cetera." Now, sir, I read of no *doctrines* in the New Testament except of the "scribes and pharisees," of "demons," of "men,"—*the use of all which must perish*. If the Priest has *doctrines* for the people to believe, there is no need of correction. We invite you to prove that any one sentiment we hold is erroneous. It will not do for *you* to charge us with "deluging the country with false doctrines." We deny it. You are now bound to prove it, or stand condemned as a "*false accuser*" of your brethren. Is it not false doctrine to teach the people that there is no "inherent efficacy in the word of God;" "*that it is a dead letter;*" that "it is a sealed book;" that "men have not the capacity to believe and obey the gospel?"

"The reforming brethren, you say, have *received into their heart the spirit of Mr. Campbell from his writings*, but they cannot receive on their believing and obeying the gospel the spirit of Jesus Christ! Yet men are *Christians* before they have put on Christ. Now, sir,

upon your own principles, that there is no other baptism but immersion; we say you cannot prove from the examples or precepts of the Apostles, that any man, woman, or child, was called *Christian before he was immersed into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of his sins*, without making the Apostles inconsistent as well as disobedient men. If they did recognize any one as a Christian after the descent of the Holy Spirit, without being immersed into the name of Jesus Christ, then you are wrong for not commencing with such. If they did not, then you are wrong and your brother "Philander" for calling them "Christians," "Presbyterian brethren," thereby inducing the *children of the Baptists* to join the Paidobaptists.

"Secretly sweeping away the vitals of religion." We challenge you to the proof of this calumny. Without you produce the evidence and allow us the privilege in your columns to expose your sophistry, we shall be justified in saying it is illiberal, unjust, and unchristian to make such a charge, when it is well known we act not *secretly* but *openly* before all men, while you and your brethren are striving to hinder us from a public discussion of our views!

What are your "vitals?" Let us hear them. If a cordial belief of the whole New Testament, a cheerful obedience, an ardent desire to "stand perfect and complete in all the will of God," is sweeping away the vitals of christianity, then, sir, your charge has some truth in it. But it is all right to contend that we are bound to obey Moses, as much as Christ; to contend for the tradition of the elders; to make the Scripture speak any thing and every thing, to force the consciences of men contrary to their best judgment or cast them out of the church. I proclaim it to all men that the conduct of the sects, if submitted to, is calculated to make hypocrites and bad men; to destroy the rights of conscience and the rights of free men.

"The four last years are *manifestation years*." In this thou speakest truly. For until then the ancient order of things and the ancient apostolic gospel were not proclaimed in all these United States, as I ever heard of. What has it brought to light? The hidden things of darkness, the cunning craftiness, and sleight of hand which the priesthood has cast upon the plainest doctrine and best book that ever man looked into. No man living could at that time make us believe that *you* and many others were in Babylon; that you and they indulged yourselves in the spirit of the man of sin, and would publish to the world the most glaring palpable misrepresentations of the gospel and the views of the advocates of the ancient apostolic gospel. Will you explain why, sir, you should undertake to judge of *motives?* "*Wished*," "*without any port in view*." How do you know our wishes? How do you know our views? This is like Mr. Clopton, who has swelled to the size of the man of sin—that is, *to judge without evidence;* "who *opposeth* and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, *as God*, sitteth in the *temple of God*, showing himself that he is a god." Bishop Semple says Mr. Clopton's standing is above the reach of Mr. Campbell. It is remarkable that not one man whom I have read, who has opposed the ancient order and gospel, but

who has assumed the character of the man of sin. Nothing but assertion, and proscription if not believed, has characterized every opponent; witness the Appomattox Decrees, the Semple and Broaddus Decrees, which have been denied by every friend of reform, and not a shadow of evidence produced to sustain them. This is the perilous age. Men shall be lovers of their *own selves*, (their word must be taken as matters of fact;) covetous, (continually crying for our money to sustain sects;) boasters, ("the stability, firmness, and piety of our Christians have been made manifest;") proud, (of their opportunities and acquaintance with history;) blasphemers, (saying "the word of God that liveth and *abideth forever*," is "a dead letter;) disobedient to parents, (children now dishonor their parents by their ungodly lives;) unthankful, (like you, Mr. Editor, that receives from our pockets, if reports be true, one thousand dollars a-year, as general agent of the Bible Society, and then call us hypocrites, pretenders, Universalists, Unitarians, &c.) unholy, (what are the religious periodicals of this day sending forth? The most glaring falsehoods;) "false accusers," (look at the calumnies, slanders, and misrepresentations of our views through all the religious journals.) These charges have been denied, proved false, and yet they are *chanted in the papers* and *adopted in the churches*. I must stop with the black list. If I were to go to *some* churches, it would prove, "like people, like priest."

"It opposes all the great plans of *christian benevolence* under the *pretence* of their being sectarian and mercenary." We hesitate not to say this is a calumny. Does Mr. Ball consider it *benevolence* to give him a thousand dollars a-year? If so, no wonder he should write such things. We deny the charges. Remember one thing reader: Mr. Ball's assertion is not to be regarded. He is a self-interested witness, as are all the priesthood more or less, that act the part of hirelings. Jesus says, "*If I bear witness of myself my witness is not to be regarded.*" [Common version "not true."] *If the word of Jesus, without testimony, was not to be regarded*, I ask if these men who assert such misrepresentations of their brethren, and rest upon their *own word* to sustain them, do not come up to the man of sin, as I have here taken from the language of the Holy Spirit? They exalt themselves above all that is worshipped or called God. God never did promise or command any thing to be done by men without giving the evidence of its truth, so far as we are capable of receiving it in our present state of weakness. He accuses no one without evidence. This is the work of the Devil. Again, Mr. Ball's benevolence is to give to those who are able in four or five years to make a donation themselves of *ten thousand dollars*. During the war between England and Burmah, if I am not mistaken, it was said Mr. Judson lost all he had. He has now made a donation (if we believe your paper of the 15th of April) of ten thousand dollars. Verily, this, if true, is a mercenary business! Also, Mrs. Wade represents herself in the following self-denying language: "We have but little furniture, and this is our little all, *and all we desire; for the more we have, the more our minds are occupied and kept back from God.*" If this be true, which

do not doubt, can it be benevolence to tempt these good people, and corrupt their minds, when they can live (they say) very cheap, and make according to Mr. Judson's success, double as much as I can, with all my laborers, teams, and farm? It is the *abuse* of these things that *we oppose*. As to what you call heresies, who are the heretics? They who sanction sectarianism, creeds, confessions of opinions, or those that cleave to the New Testament.

Yours respectfully, T. M. HENLEY.

[We are of opinion that Mr. Ball should give those whom he accuses an opportunity to vindicate themselves in his own columns. This is but common justice. We give even those who falsely accuse us a place in our paper, and we will never censure any person or sect who may not have an opportunity of appearing for themselves. But we cannot occupy our pages in addresses to opposing Editors who will slander and gag those whom they calumniate. We think it a sufficient refutation of any calumny or reproach, that the publisher of it dare not meet in his own paper those whom he accuses.] ED. M. H.

THE HISTORY OF SIN.—*No. VII.*

WORDS are called the signs of our ideas. But the magnitude of an idea is not to be measured by the magnitude of the term which represents it. The shortest words represent the greatest ideas. The greatest things in the universe are represented by monosyllables.—Amongst these the word *sin* occupies a most conspicuous place. It fills the largest space in the history of man. We do not mean that the moral evil in the world, has filled more volumes than the moral good, though this be certainly true; but all time has done little else than detail the meaning of this single word. It is a part of every history, and all history developes but a part of it.

But we have said it can be known best, or indeed, only, in its effects, and in its effects on man. Angels have by it been dethroned. Banished from God and heaven, they are reserved in chains of darkness till the judgment of the great day. Man only fell from Eden, not from Heaven. 'Twas well for him he stood no higher; yet, still, his fall brings the malignity of sin nearer to our vision. From its effects on man, we form our first, though not our best conceptions of its real nature. And what have been its effects on man? Of these too, we can form but an imperfect idea. We have never seen a sinless man. Adam in Eden we know but little of;—"But by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." All the nameless, all the countless ills embittering human life, and terminating in death and corruption, are but the first fruits of this damning principle. "When lust has conceived it brings forth sin, and sin when it is perfected, brings forth death." But our first and best approaches towards a knowledge of this "root of all bitterness," this "deadly evil thing," are made through the records of the "desolations of many generations." Of hese the Bible gives many summaries, and all history is replete with details.

Adam driven from the presence of the Lord—a flaming cherub posted at the tree of life—his wife doomed to travail, and the earth devoted to destruction, announce the conception and birth of this hateful monster. "Soon as its reign began," sorrows and pains afflict every child of man. The earth is cursed for its sake:—"Cursed is the ground for your sake; in sorrow, O man! shall you eat of it all the days of your life. Thorns, also and thistles shall it bring forth to you, and you shall eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread, till you return to the ground: for out of it you were taken, for dust you are, and to dust you shall return." As men are multiplied, sin abounds. The long and hale lives which men in the first ages enjoyed, gave them many opportunities to perfect themselves in iniquity. The earth is filled with violence, and the whole race, one family excepted, are engulphed in one tremendous ruin. So reads the first chapter of man's sad history. One general judgment, a great and terrible day of the Lord, closes the first full period of the history of sin, only 1656 years from the exile from Eden. Full forty days the windows of heaven, and the fountains of the great abyss, poured God's vengeance upon a sinful world. All the workers of iniquity, the world of the ungodly, perished in one common ruin. What an awful monument of the destructive tendency of this accursed thing! With what emotion did Noah view the dreary waste on which he disembarked, after a confinement of three hundred and seventy five days. Not a living thing meets his view of all that once moved upon the face of the earth! Where are now those busy tribes—those who planted and builded, and married, and were given in marriage? All buried from his view. The whole earth strewed with the spoils of sin, presents to him the appearance of one immense sepulchre. Babes, men, and sires, all his acquaintance of six hundred years' accumulation, all his relatives, all with whom he once conversed, and reasoned, and expostulated, are buried from his view. Instead of the busy hum of the swarming millions that once fell incessant upon his ear, all is silence. But their mouths were full of cursing and bitterness;—Their feet were swift to shed blood, destruction and misery followed in their train.—Therefore the anger of the Lord was kindled, he called to the clouds and they heard him; to the fountains of the earth, and they obeyed him. He had no pleasure in all the works of man, and rather than have such tenants, he dispossessed the earth of every thing "which had the breath of life."

The next age of the world presents no general judgment. Individuals, families, cities, and nations are visited with those tokens which speak God's estimate of moral evil. At these let us glance in passing down the stream of sacred history.

Ham, not purged from the vices of the old world, forgets the honor due to a father. In sinning against a father, he sins against God. The first commandment with a promise, regards the first relation amongst men. "The eye which mocks a father, and despises a mother: the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it." Ham honored not his father, but rather mocked him. "Cursed

then, be Canaan son of Ham, a servant of servants he shall be to his brethren." On this occasion was pronounced a curse, which yet cleaves to that people: or rather, the future destiny of that branch of Noah's family, was, at that time, sketched in a few words—Ham imports, as Dr. Hales affirms, "*burnt*, or *black*." The South, or burnt portion of Asia, along the coast of the Persian Gulf, Chusistan or Susiana and Arabia were allotted to Cush. Palestine and Syria were the portion of Canaan. And Egypt and Lybia in Africa, fell to the lot of Misraim.

Nimrod, whose name imports rebellion, was the grandson of Ham by Cush. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel says, "From the foundation of the world, none was ever found like Nimrod, powerful in hunting, and in rebellions against the Lord." He was a hunter of men, he made a prey of them, founded the first *Kingdom*, was the first *Tyrant* of the second world. He founded *Babel*, and other ancient cities of renown. The first city was called *Confusion*, or Babel, and was erected by one of the most illustrious apostates from God which the family of Ham had till then produced. Out of that land went forth Ashur and builded Nineveh; or as it reads more correctly, perhaps, in the margin, He (Nimrod) went out into Assyria and built Nineveh; for Assyria is called "the land of Nimrod," Micah v. 6. Thus in this branch of Noah's family arose men of gigantic talents in crime of every sort, and among them are found the most striking monuments of the vengeance of heaven against sin.

From one of the mountains of Armenia, on which the ark rested, the sons of Noah journeyed westward till they found a plain in the land of Shinar, somewhere contiguous to the Euphrates, where, either to prevent their dispersion, or to honor the Host of Heaven, they attempted to erect a tower. This tower was called Babel, because God in punishment of their audacity confounded their language and dispersed them Next to the abbreviating of the standard of human life, the confusion of speech contributed to check the accumulation of iniquity in the human family. But it has imposed a thousand misfortunes on the race of men, and doomed millions to destruction through its numerous and diversified influences upon the character and circumstances of man. This signal display of Divine indignation against sin is the most general judgment on the whole race inflicted since the deluge, carrying with it a voice to all people of their departure from God and alienation from one another.

The Lord scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth. This confusion of speech made the nations as it now makes sects. It had necessarily a repulsive as well as an associating tendency.

> 'Bring me,' quoth one, 'a *trowel*, quickly! quick!'
> One brings him up a *hammer*. '*Hew this brick*'
> Another bids; and then they *cleave a tree*.
> '*Make fast this rope*,' and then they *let it flee*.
> One calls for *planks;* another *mortar* lacks:
> They bear the first a *stone;* the last an *axe*.

One would have *spikes*, and him a *spade* they give:
Another asks a *saw* and gets a *sieve*.
Thus crossing crost, they *prate* and *point* in vain,
What one hath *made*, another *mars* again.

* * * * * * * * * *

These masons then seeing the storm arrived
Of God's just wrath, all weak, and heart deprived,
Forsake their purpose, and like frantic fools
Scatter their stuff, and tumble down their tools.

Du Bartas—Babylon.

In the plain of Siddim stood the five cities Sodom, Gomorrah, Zeboiim, Zoar, and Admah. The enormous wickedness of these cities drew down from heaven the most signal vengeance. Electric fire, nitrous particles ignited thereby, or, as it is commonly called, *fire and brimstone*, were rained from Heaven upon them, and not only consumed them into ashes, but the bituminous plain on which they stood was burned so deep as to become the channel of a lake seventy miles long and eighteen broad.

Lot's wife is stricken into a pillar of *salt*, emblem of the perpetuity of the monument her fate presents to all ages of the evil of disobeying God. She looked back. How dangerous it is for those who have begun to flee from the wrath to come to look back, or to apostatize, is strongly indicated in the fate of this disobedient woman.

But why dwell on individual cases? Why pause on the curse inflicted on Cain, on the son of Ham, on the wife of Lot? The time would fail me to tell of the rejection of the profane Esau, who for a morsel of food sold his birthright; of the death of Naidab and Abihu, who presumed to offer uncommanded fire before the Lord; of the fate of the son of Shebomith, who blasphemed the God of Heaven; of the destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who rebelled against the constituted authority of the priesthood, whom, with all their families and substance, the earth swallowed up alive; of the burning of the two hundred and fifty princes who joined in the same conspiracy against Moses and Aaron; of the sudden fate of Uzzah, who touched the ark of God; and of all those individual cases where every transgression and disobedience, however trivial in human sight, received a just recompense of reward. It seemed to be the design of the governor of the world to make a few examples in the beginning of every new economy, dispensation, or arrangement of society, to develope the danger of sin. Hence the thousands who fell in the wilderness. Even at the opening of the Reign of Favor it was expedient to make some examples of this sort. Hence the sudden death of Ananias and Sapphira his wife, and the sudden chastisements of the erring disciples.

But it is in the decline and fall, in the gradual and sudden overthrow of the great cities and nations of the world, in which these tokens of God's displeasure against sin, and in which its true nature and tendencies are most impressively exhibited. For the sins of those who

dwell in the most fertile lands, they are, as David says, afflicted with sterility. Egypt and Canaan are now, and long have been, monuments of this. "He turneth rivers into a wilderness, and the water-springs into dry ground; a fruitful land into barrenness for the wickedness of them that dwell therein." How often have all the terrible ministers of justice against sin been commissioned to execute wrath—the sword, the famine, the pestilence, fire, water, winds, earthquakes. These have laid in ruins the magnificence of nations, and razed the foundations of the great marts of commerce.

Egypt, once the most luxuriant in its soil, and the most renowned for its numerous and magnificent cities, has long been, as Ezekiel once said it should be, the basest of kingdoms—"It shall be the basest of kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations, for I will diminish them that they shall no more rule over the nations." (Ez. xxix. 15.) It is covered with the ruins of its temples, obelisks, pyramids, immense and innumerable cities—its artificial lakes, canals, and catacombs. The mighty Thebes with its hundred gates, once able to send through each gate 200 chariots and 10,000 fighting men, celebrated for its grandeur by Grecian and Roman poets, now lies in ruins, the habitation of bats, which are only disturbed by the torch of the curious traveller who seeks among the ruins of its temples and palaces the traces of ancient magnificence. Memphis, once the capital of middle Egypt, the seat of clusters of temples, and of that most superb one dedicated to Apis, famous for the magnitude and number of its neighboring pyramids, has been long deserted, and stands a monument in its desolations of the wealth, population, science and arts of Egypt.

The ancient cities of Lower Egypt are no more. Heliopolis, Heracleopolis, Naucrates, Tanis, in the country of which the Israelites were located, Canopus, Pelusium, are scarcely known. Alexandria, founded by Alexander the Great, and which once vied in magnificence with some of the more ancient cities of Egypt, is still inhabited; but, like Rome, it is only great in the ruins of its ancient splendor.

But where is the glory of ancient Egypt? her palaces, with their thirty dynasties of kings? her temples, with their innumerable gods and priests? her 20,000 cities, with their countless myriads of inhabitants? They only live in history; and, with the gods which they worshipped, are involved in one promiscuous destruction.

But, passing from Egypt to Assyria, we are struck with the similar fortunes of her great cities. Ninus, the son of Belus, or of Nimrod, (for these seem to be two names for the same person) founds the great city of Nineveh. He determined to make it the greatest city in the world. Placed on the eastern banks of the Tigris, its position was favorable to its rapid growth and great commercial importance. It was eighteen and three quarter miles in length, and eleven and one quarter in breadth—an oblong of 480 stadia, or 60 miles, three day's journey in circumference—surrounded with walls 100 feet high, and so broad that three chariots could go abreast with ease. These were adorned and fortified with 1500 towers 200 feet high. Ninus, in his

expedition against the Bactrians, after the completion of Nineveh, commanded an army of 1,700,000 foot, 200,000 horse, and about 16,000 chariots armed with scythes. This gives us some idea of the population of this empire in those times.

Semiramis, the surviving wife of Ninus, resolves, in the ambition of her husband, to found a city of equal, if not superior grandeur and magnificence. The plains of Shinar furnished a site for this great undertaking. Two millions of men, drawn from her vast empire, were employed in the rearing of this city. Its walls were 350 feet high, 87 feet thick, and in compass 480 furlongs. Thus Babylon, for that was its name, was sixty miles in circumference. It differed from Nineveh not in size, but only in being a perfect square, each wall 15 miles in length. The excavations for the making of the brick and mortar, or bitumen for these walls, formed the channel for an immense canal round the walls. Twenty-five immense gates of solid brass, separated from each other by three lofty towers at proper distances, decorated each wall—thus giving to the city one hundred gates and three hundred towers. Its streets passed from gate to gate fifteen miles long, and intersected each other at right angles. This gave the city 50 full streets 15 miles, and 676 squares, each more than half a mile on each street: besides, one branch of the Euphrates passed through the city, and its streets were 150 feet wide. The quays and bridges in the city, and the lake, ditches, and canals made for the draining of the river and giving direction to the waters during the risings of the river, are among the ancient wonders of the world. By these the city was protected from inundation, and the waters of the Euphrates were poured into the Tigris. Its palaces, the temple of Belus, more august than any of the pyramids of Egypt, and its hanging gardens, raised even to the summit of its towers, gave it an appearance of greatness and grandeur never equalled by any city on earth. But where now the glory of Assyria!

Nineveh and Babylon have long since been destroyed. Tobit, before his death said—"The ruin of Nineveh is at hand; abide no longer here, for I perceive the wickedness of the city will cause its destruction." The Babylonians and the Medes, not long afterwards, laid it desolate. Babylon, just 50 years after she had destroyed Jerusalem and carried Israel captive, was taken by Cyrus. From that day it began to decline. The inhabitants gradually migrated from it. The kings of Persia made it a park for wild beasts, verifying the words of Isaiah xiii. 21. "Wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and dragons shall dwell in their pleasant palaces. But the walls began to fall; and in the time of Alexander the Great, the Euphrates, by decaying walls, was compelled to abandon its channel. The waters, obstructed in their course, finally made it a sort of marsh, and hid the ruins of Babylon from the knowledge of the world. Alexander attempted to open the old channel of the Euphrates to rebuild the city; but his death, two years afterwards, put an end to the work. For the Lord had said, long before, "I will cut off from Babylon the name and remnant"—"I will make it pools of water"—"I will make

it a possession for the bittern and pools of water: and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, says the Lord of Hosts." Thus vanished the seat of an Empire which stood for 1660 years; and thus perished the pride and magnificence of a city unrivalled in the annals of time for its wealth, grandeur and magnificence.

EDITOR.

LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

LETTER VI.

SIR—

YOU modestly style yourself "a private student" of the Evidences of Christianity. But whether you have studied to find reasons why you should believe, or reasons why you should not believe that Jesus was in truth what he professed, or an impostor, you have not positively informed us. From one of his sayings, however, we are inclined to infer that you never studied the book with a desire to believe it. He has said of those, and to those who were like you, deists, not atheists, "If any person is minded to do his will, he shall know of my doctrine whether I speak from myself or from him who sent me." Jesus the Messiah never uttered a weak or erroneous saying, though to the sages of this world some of them may appear so. But when fairly and honestly examined, his maxims and sayings indicate a perfect knowledge of all the principles of human action. In his judgment, then it appears that every one who, like the Jews, acknowledge one God, and who is minded or determined to do the will of that God, will know whether Jesus spoke from himself or from him who sent him. There cannot, then, be an honest deist in existence. I mean one honest to himself and to God.

I need not tell you that, regarding Jesus of Nazareth to be the only *Saviour* of men, and his name to be the *only name* proclaimed under heaven by which any human being can be saved, I can do no less than subscribe, ex animo, to every maxim of his. This maxim, I therefore say, compels me to regard every deist as not *minded* to do the will of the God whom he acknowledges.

You are aware how very differently the testimony of a friend and of an enemy is regarded. When the sayings of an enemy are examined, many imperfections and errors are discovered which we could not see in the sayings of one whom we love and esteem. A person who examines that he may believe, and one who examines that he may reject, view the testimony through very different media. The one imagines contradictions and errors where they do not exist, while the other is only intent to have those things which appear contradictory explained. The one is always concerned to know how he will dispose of the arguments for, if he should fail to remove the objections against, the testimony of Jesus—the other, how he will most easily dispose of the arguments for, that the objections against, may have the greater weight. He who reads that he may believe dwells chiefly upon the arghments for, and he who reads that he may reject dwells with satis-

faction upon the objections against. When the sun shines upon a meadow, and upon a dunghill, it produces very different exhalations. The same beams darting upon different objects, draw forth very diverse effluvia. The same intellect too, poring with intensity upon objections to christianity, minded if possible to arrive at conclusions authorizing the casting off of the fear of God and the denunciations against those who work iniquity; and the mind poring upon the arguments for, and the objections against, that it may settle down in a firm and unshaken confidence in the professions of the Saviour of the World, deduces or draws from the same premises conclusions and results very opposite indeed. To the one mind apparent contradictions are corroborating arguments; to the other real agreement is probable contradiction, and apparent contradiction downright falsehood, fanaticism, priestcraft, and superstition.

In my last letter to you I have, without going into details, disposed of upon principles which cannot be argued against, all your "plenty of contradictions." *You cannot overturn those principles; and admitting them, you cannot find a single contradiction in the book.* But more desirous to convince than to confute you, I wish to direct your inquiries to the state of mind in which you approach your "private studies" upon the evidences of christianity.

Ridicule, you know, is no test of truth. You may ridicule the most exalted character, and the most brilliant virtue which adorns it. You may call patriotism, rebellion; heroism, knight errantry; humility, madness; generosity, extravagance; piety, superstition; and devotion, fanaticism. You may ridicule the forgiveness of injuries under the character of cowardice, and laugh at the courteous in the character of a parasite. Thus you are able to laugh at Mary and Martha, and Susannah and Joanna, under the character of gossips; and you can fill a few pages upon Mary Magdelene, as a woman of no good fame. You can take the words "some doubted," at the close of Matthew's testimony, and fill a page upon the incompetency of the witnesses. You can make a sentence for Peter or Paul, and then ridicule it as if Peter and Paul had spoken or written as yourself.

What a stupid impostor or knave must Matthew have been to have told that some of the disciples doubted whether it was the same Jesus when he meditated, as you allow, to give all the verisimilitude to his narrative possible! And what stupid souls have been all who have believed upon the testimony of those who declare that the witnesses themselves doubted whether he that appeared to give the commission was the same who was crucified!

Truly you represent Matthew as a very shrewd impostor! But if this shrewdness should be a proof of honesty, and the doubts expressed be only whether it was Jesus who appeared, and if these doubts were entertained only while he was at some distance, and vanished when he drew near, what then? Your wit and humor are your own! The laugh is at yourself.

But to explain the frequent appearances of the risen Saviour, you have only to assume that the Apostles had chosen one to personate

him, and that Thomas was absent, and being an honest man was deceived by the others into a renunciation of his doubts. Again, you tell us that the historian Mark sends Jesus to heaven the day after he rose from the dead, while John keeps him on earth for five or six weeks—and a hundred other things about his resurrection which no man of sense can regard in any other light than as the most contemptible puerilities of an undiscerning mind, oppressed with some evil genius, or laboring under some species of alienation, either from infirmity, or from a conscience haunted with the recollections of many years devoted to such practices as unfit a man for the enjoyment of immortality, and divest him of the desire for it.

Your representing the Apostles as laboring to induce the belief of a lie in which their fortune and fame were concerned, is so opposite to all probability that I never knew a deist who had the hardihood to make such an assertion. Great fame and fortune indeed! to lose all respectability among men, to suffer all privations, and the most severe death which deists, and atheists, and polytheists could inflict upon them.

The whole mind and strength of your pamphlet is fairly drawn to a focus in one proposition, viz: The four Evangelists have not recorded a single miracle, the crucifixion, resurrection or ascension of the Saviour, in precisely the same words, or in words representing exactly the same ideas; therefore their narratives are tissues of lies, falsehoods, fables, and the whole is incredible. Now the fact is, that were the testimonies of the original witnesses just such as you would make them, or have them to be, neither yourself nor any person else could believe them.

Peter and Paul are the two most noted preachers of the gospel mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles—the former to the Jews, the latter to the Gentiles. We have several of their sermons on record. They always preached the gospel; and one of them said that if man or angel should proclaim any other gospel than he proclaimed, he ought to be accursed. Now in your mode of reasoning, neither of these men, nor any other men, ever did preach twice the same gospel; for they never used the same words, nor expressed on any two occasions all the same ideas—nay, there is on your principles no credible history in the world. Of some eight or ten histories of England, of Germany, of France, of the American Colonies and Revolution, there is not one credible; they are all a tissue of lies and fables, for no two of them agree in narrating any one prominent event: that is, no two of them use exactly the same words, or give exactly the same ideas.

You make much use of one sentence in my debate with Mr. Owen which you either totally misunderstand or greatly pervert. It is an attempt to discriminate between what in the Jewish and Christian scriptures is worthy of the name of *Divine Revelation.* We contemplate not every thing said by every body whose name is found in the books in the light of a communication from heaven to men: and with us the phrase "*the word of God*," or "*the word of the Lord*," in the Apostolic writings, indicates only the last communication, called *the*

gospel, or new institution of the Saviour. And, indeed, that which declares the philanthropy of God in the mission of his Son to be the saviour of the world, that word of reconciliation which purifies the heart and reforms the life of man, is, *the gospel*, or *word of God*, contradistinguished from all other things written in the book. It is as much the object of these writings to reveal man to himself, to give a fair outline of the best and worst things in the history of man, and in God's government over man, as to reveal the character of God and his purposes concerning man. Much of both Testaments is occupied with all details necessary for this purpose. Besides, the prophecies of the future, and the record of the past, are all intended to give proper emphasis to, and to accumulate light upon, *the goodness* concerning the Saviour, whom all good men love, honor, and obey, and whom all wicked men insult and traduce, as did his betrayers and murderers.

But, sir, your attack, scurrilous, abusive, and common as it is, upon the witnesses, is only a lying in ambush, like the dragon in the wilderness, to devour a certain child as soon as born: for *no testimony* could induce you to believe in such a miracle as *the resurrection of a dead man!* This is your own confession. But as I have shown you, long since, you do admit that one man, the father of the race, was raised from the dead, or that life was communicated to one man miraculously. In this you are at war with your own theory; and until you give some reconciliation of this matter with your own principles, it is preposterous to make that an objection to the second Adam which you ascribe to the first.

In this letter I only intended to call your attention to the state of mind in which you enter upon your private studies of the Evidences of Christianity; but lifting up your pamphlet, and glancing over a few pages of it, to find if there was any thing unnoticed in my former letters worthy of attention, I have been led to make the above general and disconnected remarks. Whenever you can furnish me with one, and only one contradiction in the New Testament, on the principles submitted in my last, I will specially attend to it. If you please to send me one contradiction, made out in proper form, and written in such style as will not shock the nerves of any of my readers, male or female, I will engage to show, according to right reason, that there is no contradiction in it. In all good will, respectfully,

EDITOR.

PROPHECIES—*No. VIII.*

OUR third proposition has not been lost sight of in our previous essays. The 5th, 6th, and 7th prepared the way for its advantageous illustration and proof; and we might, we think, add, partially illustrated and proved it. The apparent impossibility of the moral means which the simple testimony of God furnishes to the subversion of the rulers of the darkness of this world, to the dethronement of spiritual wickedness, elevated to high places, by the corrupt and corrupting politics of nations sold to their hierarchies, teach us to look somewhere

else than to modern missionary exertions for giving that triumph to christianity with which every page of prophecy relative to the reign of a thousand years is replete. What moral means, unaided by the judgments of God, unaccompanied by miracles, have ever achieved a victory over any portion of mankind, so great as that promised to the world during the reign of Jesus? Not an island on the globe, not a city in any age or country, has seen, or tasted, or felt such a moral revolution as that guaranteed by the Prince of the kings of the earth, when the kingdoms of the world, when the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the holy ones of the Most High.

Can any man in his sober senses, with the history of modern Europe before him, (to say nothing of Asia and Africa, enslaved to idolatry or sold to Mahomet,) suppose, or promise to himself, that a few sectarian missionaries, sustained by a divided and secular church, can so revolutionize the world as to introduce a *moral*, much less a *literal* reign of Christ over all the race of men? If every sectarian proclaimer from both Christian continents should become a missionary, and the whole be landed in Asia and Africa, and go to work there with all the energies which they employ at home; I say, could they do more among Pagans than they do among the sons and daughters of Christians at home? Could they in five hundred years produce a better state of society among Turks and Pagans than they have produced in Britain and America? Alas! what have they done in Britain and the United States? How few of this population are even within the pale of sectarian altars; and of that few how few do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly! how few live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world! It would require more than all the moral influence of all the teachers of religion on both continents to give good morality to Europe and America.

Can even the Lutheran Reformation establish itself in Europe? Can the gospel, manacled and fettered with the traditions of fifteen centuries—oppressed and humbled with the immoralities of its professed friends, march back to Rome and re-occupy the grounds on which it stood before the man of sin was born! Reason declares it impossible. Experience proves the hope to be a delusion. Error has the chair or the throne in every "christian land." Backed by "the powers that be," she wages a successful war against the humble advocates for ancient truth and morals. She controls the literature and the wealth of nations, and presses into her service all the lusts of men. With this fearful odds is simple truth equal to the conflict, unaided by that power of God which went with them who first carried it to the nations? In Europe and America christian deaths out-count christian births, with all the revivals of every name. Six thousand years to come, upon all the ratios of success which the last three hundred years bring to our aid, would be too short to put all the kingdoms of the world under the sceptre of Jesus Christ.

The politics, and commerce, and literature of christendom are all hostile to the powers of the world to come. Even in these United

States how rapid is the departure from the first principles of our government! How swift the descent from the pure republican principles of the fathers of this union! Have nations, as such, ever been reformed by moral arguments? What government ever improved as it became older! In what nation, in what history can it be found? The annals of six thousand years afford no such moral miracle. Degeneracy has long been the order of the day. Nations, like individuals, are always most innocent in their infancy. Churches, or rather sects, are so also. Methodism and Quakerism are yet fresh in our recollection, and speak volumes in proof of our position. Moral means reform not nations, and too seldom sects. The *ultima ratio regum*—the sword and the cannon argue with the most effect among a reprobate people. Politics gave to Luther and his cause an influence which his gospel could not have obtained. The same is true of Calvin. But look at mighty Rome—mighty in her weakness—and still holding the wealth and literature of nine-tenths of christendom along with Peter's keys. She rules the councils of Europe, and increases annually more than six per cent. in America. It is without precedent, without reason, against experience, and, I think, against prophecy, to think and argue that the mere proclamation of the gospel will or can break down the hierarchies of Europe, the power of the Pope, the influence of the Koran, or the superstitions of the Pagans. Our first argument in proof of the personal appearance of Christ is drawn from these premises—from the reason and nature of things—in a word, from the consideration that nothing short of his real presence and power can bring the nations to his feet.

But on these reasonings, plausible as they may seem, and one might say that plausible they are, we would not rely to prove a matter of such importance as that proposed, were we not sustained by the strong current of all the prophecies.

Daniel the great prophet, a man greatly beloved of the God of saints, saw in his clearer visions that *the little horn*, that power which spake so blasphemously against God and the saints—that horn which had the eyes of a man and the mouth of more than a man, which spake great things, and whose look was more stout than any of the ten horns; he saw this horn *prevail* as well as make war against the saints *until the Ancient of days came*, and judgment was given to the saints—(there were saints when the Lord came,) and the time come that the saints possessed the kingdom. Into the hand of him personated by the horn the saints were given for a time, and times, and the dividing of a time; during all of which periods he thought to change times and laws, and to *wear out* the saints of the Most High But he saw the thrones cast down and the Ancient of days appeared—the judgment was set. His throne was like the fiery flame, and its wheels as burning fire; a fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set and the books were opened. What followed this appearance of the Ancient of days, and this opening of the judgment! The greatness of the

kingdom, the kingdom and the dominion, was then given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Thus we see that the saints were to be kept down and worn out by *the little horn*, without any intermission, till the judgment of the antichristian world. Then the Lord with his thousands of thousands appears in their behalf and gives them the victory over their enemies.

To this agree also the plainer intimations of Paul in his epistle to the Thessalonians. The man of sin and son of perdition exalts himself, sits in the temple of God. The Lord consumes him by his word, but he is only consumed by the word of his mouth. He is not destroyed until the brightnesss of his coming. The Lord sudddenly comes in his glory and sends him to perdition. Thus Daniel and Paul teach us that the sudden appearance of the Lord precedes the perdition and destruction of that usurper who has so long triumphed on the throne of Jesus. He usurps the throne of him whom God placed upon his holy hill, whom he exalted a Prince and Saviour. He has long presumed to legislate for, and to dispense forgiveness to, those called Christians. But he will be utterly cast down and destroyed for strong is the Lord who will take vengeance upon him.

But the Jewish Prophets speak of the coming of Jesus in a way which precludes the application of their words to any moral, or metaphorical, or figurative coming. Thus says Zachariah, xiv. 4. 5. "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East; and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof, towards the East and towards the West, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove towards the North, and half of it towards the South." These sayings are certainly not applicable to his *first* coming; for the events here described then happened in no sense. From this mount he ascended literally, and the angels said he should descend as (literally) as they had seen him ascend to heaven. Behold he comes in clouds; all kindreds shall see him and bewail his approach: for behold his reward is with him. As he ascended from Mount Olivet he will descend to it. They shall then say, 'Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord.'

When he descends to put down all bad government, all influences opposed to his reign, as the Lord of the whole earth, to avenge his enemies—then the earth shall shake; mountains and hills shall be moved out of their places, and shall flow down at his presence. "His brightness shall be as the light; he holds in his hand the horns that oppose him, and there shall be the hiding of his power. Before him the pestilence; and burning coals at his feet. He shall stand and measure the earth; he shall behold, and drive asunder the nations, and the everlasting mountains shall be scattered, and the perpetual hills shall bow: his ways are everlasting. The mountains saw thee, and they trembled: the overflowing of the water passed by: the deep uttered his voice and lifted up his hands on high. The Sun and Moon stood still in their habitation: at the light of thine arrows they went,

and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou shalt march through the land in indignation: thou shalt thresh the heathen in thine anger." "Who shall abide this day of his coming; for he shall be as the refiner's fire and as the fuller's soap, and shall sit as a refiner and purifier. He will consume the dross and purge the sons of Levi, as gold and silver is purified, that they may offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness." When he arises to shake terribly the earth then shall these things literally come to pass; for he will hurl down the cities of the nations and shiver the tyrants of the earth. Then will great Babylon not be forgotten. The cup of the wine of his fiercest wrath shall be presented to her. Drink it she must. She will be utterly and for ever ruined: for strong is the arm that takes vengeance upon her. As she measured sorrow and torment to his saints, so he shall measure sorrow and torment to her. The saints, too, shall witness it: for all the martyrs of Jesus, all who lost their lives for God and Christ, shall then be raised from the dead. This is the first resurrection. Holy and happy he who is invited to this marriage supper of the Lamb! Holy and happy he who has part in this first resurrection, for the second death shall not touch him!

The martyrs are with their King when he appears against his and their enemies. "Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets!" Now is the time for you to triumph, for God has avenged you on her. "I saw the souls of them who were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God, who had never worshipped the beast, nor his image, nor had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Then shall be verified that saying of the Lord, "Whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall save it." The rest of the dead saints and sinners will not be raised till after the thousand years' reign of the martyrs and their martyred King shall have been fulfilled. To heaven they will ascend, and with Jesus they shall reign during one thousand years as a happy reversion for their sorrows and lives lost for the Lord's sake. The first resurrection and the burial of Antichrist shall be contemporaneous; for when the Lord appears for salvation to his saints, it will always be to the destruction of his and their enemies. Hence the heavens and the earth, sun, moon, and stars, mountains and valleys, oceans and seas, cities and the wilderness, are all grouped together in the pictures and visions of this terrible day of the Lord.

From these premises, so far detailed, we presume our third proposition begins to appear probable, at least, to all who inquire diligently what the Spirit says to the churches. Let every one who has an ear to hear, regard what the Spirit says to the churches. He who testifies these things, says, Surely I come quickly.

"When the King of kings comes,
When the Lord of lords comes;
We shall have a joyful day
When the King of kings comes:

To see the nations broken down,
And kingdoms once of great renown,
And saints, now suff'ring, wear the crown
When the King of kings comes!"

DANIEL.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. III.*

THE question of *justification* is a question which all confess to be worthy of the most serious, solemn, and profound investigation. It is now revived. The meaning of christian immersion has called up this question in a new form, and has elicited, and is likely still to elicit, a peculiar attention. We are bold to affirm our conviction that since the great apostacy from original christianity, justification has not been placed clearly, fully, scripturally, satisfactorily before the minds of any portion of the community.

Expecting to have seen before this date the remarks of Mr. Andrew Broaddus on the "*Extra, No.* 1, *on Remission of Sins*," we have delayed offering to our readers any remarks on the subject of remission of sins under the term *justification*. Archippus has made it necessary that we should pay some attention to it sooner than we had contemplated. What appears to us a confused view of the doctrine of *justification*, liés at the bottom of the opposition to immersion for the forgiveness of sins. In anticipation of the forthcoming review of Mr. Broaddus, and in reply to the essays of Archippus on the import of baptism as preached to the Gentiles, we are constrained to call the attention of our readers to the "doctrine of justification." Archippus and Mr. Broaddus, however they may agree in the import of immersion, appear to stand upon the ground that *the Gentiles are justified by faith* ALONE. Now, reader, is it not strange that differing from them both, and they differ from one another in some respects, we should take the same premises; or, in other words, contend with them that we are justified by faith, and yet preach *immersion for the remission of sins?* Such, however, is the fact, as the sequel will show.

Every thing here, as in all other discussions and examinations, depends on the proper definition of the terms. The "*doctrine*" of justification is with us the meaning of the word *justification:* for words are signs of ideas, and therefore our ideas are known by words. The first question here, then, is, In what sense did the Jews, or rather in what sense did the Apostles use the terms *justify, justified, justification?* This decided, and we are prepared to examine the objections of our dissenting brethren.

Ask the gentlemen of the forum, or rather the members of the courts of judicature, what this term imports in their usage, and we vouch for them they will not say that to be justified and to be pardoned are the same thing. Nay, they will assert that they cannot be applied to the same person in the same state. The person justified with them cannot be pardoned; and he that is with them pardoned, cannot be justified; for he is condemned. Hence pardons come not to the justified, but to the condemned. To justify a person with them

is to prove him innocent of the crime alleged—it is to declare him *just;* and, therefore, he that is justified with them has nothing to be forgiven. Commentators on law and religion admit this to be the forensic import of the term. But the question is, Did the Jews, or did the Apostles use the term in the forensic use? Or did they use it as equivalent to *pardon?* To decide this matter with certainty, we have only to examine the use of the term in all the passages in which it occurs. Some of them will doubtless furnish decisive evidences of the meaning which they applied to *justify, justified,* and *justification.*

After a diligent examination of all the passages in which this term occurs, we are assured that, with them, to be pardoned and to be justified represented the same state, or the same act; and, therefore, pardon and justification were, with them, synonymous. For examples:—

Before detailing these examples which fix its meaning in reference to the question of personal justification or pardon, it ought to be remarked that the word is sometimes used in a forensic sense when applied to persons not needing pardon. Thus Jesus is said to have been *justified* in, or by the Spirit; *i. e.* declared to be just, or fully sustained in all his pretensions to be the Messiah. "Wisdom is also *justified* of her children." "By thy words thou shalt be *justified.*" "That thou mightest be *justified* in thy sayings," sustained or proved to be just and true. But these are not to the point, and we only allude to them for the sake of the captious.

In reference to sinners, it is equivalent to *pardon.* Acts xiii. 39. "Through this man is proclaimed to you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things (from all sins) from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." Here it certainly is equivalent to *pardon* or *forgiveness of sins.* Thus the term "justified" is used always in the Acts of Apostles. Paul, in the Romans, uses it in the same sense, chap. iv. verse 5. "God *justifieth* the ungodly." In proof of this justification of the ungodly, he quotes David saying, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered! Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The non-imputation of sin, the remission of it, and justification, are here shown to be convertible phrases—of the same sense and meaning. In the same chapter, verse 25, the Apostle says Jesus was delivered for our offences and raised again, not for our offences, but for the removal of them—"*for our justification.*" In the 5th chapter also it is used in the same sense;—condemnation for one offence and justification from many offences are contrasted to show the difference between the Fall and the free gift by Jesus. But, indeed, it is always used in this sense when a change of state is spoken of, or when sinners are said to be justified.

The term "justify," and all its derivatives, being thus defined, we are now prepared to inquire whether a man is justified or pardoned by faith. If we ask the Westminster Assembly they will soon decide this matter. They ask the question and answer it for us:—

"*Quest.* 70. What is justification?"

"*Ans.* Justification is an act of God's free grace unto sinners, in

which he pardoneth all their sin, (very good) accepteth and accounteth their persons righteous in his sight, (very good) not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone."

This *by faith alone* is Archippus' and I think my friend Broaddus' answer to the question. I would say *by faith alone* too, had it not been that James positively says "*not by faith alone.*" "You see," says James, "that a man is justified by works, and not by faith *alone.*" That a man is justified by faith, both Paul and James declare; but neither of them will say by faith *alone.* This is just the jet of the whole controversy—by faith in connexion with other considerations, or by faith alone.

Those who preach pardon by faith alone, among whom is my friend Archippus, rely upon those passages which speak of justification and faith as connected; such as "God will justify the pagan by faith," or "being justified by faith," &c. not considering that none of them says what the Assembly's catechism says, viz: that we are justified by faith alone. We preach that a man is justified by faith; but they add "*alone.*" Now we have the scriptures, and they have not; and that is all the difference between us. They have not a verse, from Genesis to Revelation, which says "by faith alone"—we have one that says "not by faith alone," and some that ascribe pardon and justification to other principles, as worthy of having "*alone*" attached to them as faith.

I would ask my friends who proclaim *faith alone*, whether they would allow us to say by grace alone, by blood alone, by works alone, by water alone, by knowledge alone? and it must be confessed that sinners are said to be justified, or pardoned, or saved, by each of these. "By grace you are saved;" but not by grace alone—"God has saved you by the washing of regeneration;" but not by the washing of regeneration only—"Baptism does also now save us;" but not baptism alone—"justified by his blood;" but not by his blood alone—"you see that a man is justified by works;" but not by works alone. If, then, they will not allow us to add "alone" to grace, blood, water, works; we will not allow them to add "alone" to faith. Grace, blood, knowledge, faith, water, the Holy Spirit, and good works, are all necessary to the enjoyment of the full salvation of the gospel. Hence either justification or salvation is acribed to each of these, in the oracles of God—"You are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus"—"Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him"—"By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many, whose iniquities he shall have borne"—"Being justified by faith, we have peace with God"—"Immersion does also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"—"God has saved us, not by works of righteousness (previously done) but by his own mercy through the bath of regeneration and *the renewal of the Holy Spirit.* You see that a man is justified by works, and not by faith alone." Give, then, to

each of these its due, its proper place in the development and enjoyment of the salvation of the gospel, and we have the whole Apostolic doctrine; but so soon as any sectary comes with his pen and places *alone* when and where he pleases, and thus excludes one, or changes the order of some of these great principles, he assumes the character of him whom we Protestants distinguish by the appellation of Anti-Christ. We speak not of any of the human family who have not had the gospel preached to them, but of those to whom the word of this salvation is sent, and to them we say, that each and all of these are necessary to the full enjoyment of this salvation. You must *confess* to salvation as well as believe to righteousness; you must have the knowledge of God and his Son Jesus Christ; you must have the grace of God and receive the blood of Christ, and be immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus, as well as implicitly rely upon all that is promised in the book. So we speak to all those who have ears to hear what the Spirit of God testifies to mankind concerning Jesus and his salvation.

In hopes that Archippus and my friend Andrew Broaddus will give all that consideration which is due to these remarks, I have, in reply to the former and in anticipation of the latter, hastily sketched the premises for various arguments, which shall be forthcoming when occasion requires.

Please, reader, remember these are but *premises*. Yet from them we have, we think, already concluded, to the conviction or confutation of all opponets, that, to say salvation comes, is received, or enjoyed by faith alone, is not of God, but of man.

EDITOR.

THE TIMES.—*No. V.*

A. W. CLOPTON.

Mr. A. W. CLOPTON, having abandoned his proposed review of my works, or deferred it, continues to issue his Nos. without discussing any one point, or attempting to sustain his views from the sacred oracles. He has great use for letters from the opponents of reform; and he swells his notices with the opinions of his coadjutors in the work of detraction, slander, and misrepresentation. Men like Mr. Garner McConnico, of Franklin, Tennessee, whose reputation at home for the morality of christianity can obtain them no influence in society, and whose preaching falls dead from their lips, not only because of its inherent insipidity, but because of the insincerity of their lives, count as witnesses against reformation at the distance of seven hundred or a thousand miles from home. Far would it be from me to suppose or to insinuate that all who write letters to order for A. W Clopton, are such Corinthians or Thyatirans as Mr. Clopton's brother of the South, or his *Winters** brother of the North. We *know* that the influence of the chief of his letter writers, like spurious paper, is incomparably more current abroad than at home.

*Strange to tell, Mr. John Winters is now standing as the pastor of the second or third Regular Baptist Church in Pittsburgh!!!

Some good men are necessary to sustain even the most popular projects; and I might add, that a few names of towering reputation for morality will, like Noah, carry in the same ark a goodly number of "unclean beasts" and reptiles, all useful in making up a world. But this is his mode of warfare, to enlist all to whom reformation is most offensive, (because, perhaps, they need so much of it themselves) to write letters to him in proof of the errors of reformers and the soundness of his own faith, and then, after mutually endorsing for one another, to send their paper into market as a safe medium of religious merchandizing in the wares of the gospel.

I pay no attention to these endorsers, knowing the real value of their estates; and I would as willingly take the paper of Andrew Fuller without the name of A. W. Clopton, G. McConnico, or even John Kerr, of Richmond, as when endorsed by the three. Concerning the latter kind and courteous gentleman, I could have wished, from motives of personal friendship, to have seen him more prudent and cautious about lending his name to those who have recently made themselves his friends from policy rather than affection. But Mr. Clopton and his endorsers, *en masse*, cannot sustain a single position in opposition to the cause we plead, by an appeal, logical and fair, to *the Book* that will judge us all in the great day. By that I stand or fall. And so must they.

I do not receive "the Index" regularly, owing to miscarriages, and have not all the numbers at hand. But I presume I have read, with the exception of one, all the Budgets of my friend Clopton, without any other conviction than that he feels his inability to sustain his own cause, or oppose that which I plead, by any other means than human testimony. On that he relies from first to last. I must acknowledge that my estimate of his character as an honest but prejudiced man has lowered with every piece I have seen from his pen. His foul insinuations and recklessness of truth in avowing that I was the author of certain pieces in the Christian Baptist signed "Querens," extinguished the last hope that he was rather the child of prejudice than "of wrath even as others." Neither did a whole number, written to clear himself from being the inventor and lover of such frauds, exculpate him in the least. I would engage to tell him, and will, on his application, give him the name of the author of those pieces, if he will not publish it, and if he will acknowledge his mistake and promise to reform.

I was willing at one time to allow that a good man might be so far mistaken as to think it his duty to preach and travel as solicitor for the Star and Columbian College at a decent salary per annum, and suppose that in so doing he was acting like a missionary of the cross and in duty bound to oppose any thing under the name of reformation which endangered his standing, in this relation, with the people; I say, I was willing to give such a one the credit of honesty and good intentions; but if a person will raze in our bosom the last favorable impression, what can we do but give up to him his own character, and permit him to be the architect of his own fortune and reputation.

He has taken the bounty from the friends of the present order of things, and is now bound to sustain the schemes which sustain him. I would not make him a *covenant-breaker*, if in my power; and will therefore permit him to fulfil his day, and patiently wait for the going down of the sun. But should he ever dare to trust his cause to even a single argument other than *Vox populi—Vox Dei*, I will attend to it. But we have something else to do than to wrangle with A. W. Clopton about on which side of the question stood or stand certain men, or whether their standing on that side is any proof that it was, or is. the cause of God. Good and respectable names have unfortunately been found arrayed against reformation in every age. Even in the time of the Apostles there were *seventy* elders out of *seventy-two* who continued firm to the last breath in opposition to the *holy Twelve*. Annas, Caiaphas, John and Alexander Herod, Pontius Pilate, with many of the grandees and nobles in the Jewish nation and out of it, kept the great mass of the people in opposition to the proclaimers of reformation. Their names are inscribed upon a page more durable, to say the least, than that in which stands the Catholic anti-reformers, or that on which Mr. Clopton desires to enrol G. McConnico and his Virginia brotherhood.

But the times have changed somewhat, and he that thinks to carry a cause by the dint of names preceded by Rabbi, Rev. or Venerable, may perhaps live to see the day when his own friends will deride and blame him for a course which, however wise and judicious in the times of Wickliffe, Huss, or Luther, was ridiculous in the year of grace 1831.

But this is one of the most discriminating characters of the age in which we live. No man trusts himself to argue the cause at the bar of reason and revelation. All confide on their standing with the people, and allege the old argument of numbers and respectability, which the Catholics played off with so much advantage to their cause against the Protestant Reformation. One-sided publications from the pulpit and the press; groundless insinuations against them who have sacrificed all that the age will permit them to sacrifice in the cause of the ancient gospel; and appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people, backed by the names of those in authority, constitute that mighty triumvirate which seeks to control the public mind and manners of the age. EDITOR.

HINTS ON DECORUM.

DEAR SIR,

I BELONG to a church which has got into some difficulties in consequence of the want of experience. We are all young disciples; none of us have been baptized more than two years; and, with the exception of myself and two others, all have been baptized within the last fifteen months. We are now about forty-eight in number, and are all zealous in keeping the commandments of our Lord and Master. Our meetings are spiritedly kept up; but we fail in being able to conduct them so much to our edification as I think we ought. Two or

three of us are much in favor of devoting a part of the day to the examination of the Scriptures, and to making our remarks upon them; but on some occasions we have got into something like a debate, and I have thought the feelings of some have been hurt on all such occasions. We have had one case of discipline, but were more embarassed to understand the law in the case, than in estimating the merits of the difficulty. Could you give us some hints, the result of your experience; for it appears there is no law nor necessity for a law in the New Testament for conducting meetings? The things to be done are taught, but we are left to right reason for the manner of doing them; at least so I conclude. Will you communicate through the "Harbinger?"

J. T.

H——, Ohio, May 21, 1831.

REPLY.

Dear brother J. T.

I WOULD not, if I could, sketch out a routine of church etiquette, or of christian courtesy. In these matters, where the Apostles have not enjoined, we ought to be free. We ought also to avoid all the stiffness and formality which spring from law, or mere rules of decorum. But as you merely ask for my experience in one matter, I will suggest the outlines of it in especial reference to matters of discussion. I will, *Deo volente*, call the attention of our readers to church discipline after some matters on hands are disposed of; till then I will only suggest as follows:—

Since the fashion of occupying the Lord's day in delivering and hearing public orations on religion has obtained so universally, presidents, or those *elders to rule well* named by the Apostles, have become unnecessary in conducting the worship and edification of christian congregations. Our teachers, improperly called *bishops*, except in so far as they oversee themselves doing every thing—reading, praying, preaching, baptizing, and administering ordinances, &c. have not the office, and are not acquainted with the duties of a president of a christian congregation. "Let him who presides do it with care" applies not to them, nor to any officer known in popular establishments.

When a society of disciples meets on the Lord's day for the reasons which convoked the primitive disciples, they cannot proceed to any of the duties or privileges of the day without the appointment of some persons to office, or unless some person assumes the office requisite to the different parts of christian worship.

He that says, "Brethren, let us read, sing, or pray," acts the part of a president; and he who takes charge of the contributions of the brethren acts the steward or deacon, whether he assumed it or is appointed by the brethren. Our object in this essay is not to attempt an investigation or development of the nature or necessity of the appointment of persons to preside in such congregations where there is no bishops and where they meet for mutual edification and worship; but rather to suggest a few hints on *the manners and customs* which ought to be practised in these assemblies.

In the first place, the congregation having agreed upon the hours of coming together and of adjournment, and having some person to preside for the day, the first thing after the usual salutation of the brethren is, that the president opens the meeting by declaring the purposes for which they have come together. The president of any body, civil or religious, simply presides, introduces the business of the meeting, and is the organ through which the church speaks. He is therefore the speaker of the house—not because he speaks *most*, but because he speaks with *authority*. He is the tongue of the congregation. He is therefore to be honored as such; for in honoring him the congregation honors itself.

If he call upon a brother to preside at the Lord's table, or to read, sing, or pray; that person is to suppose himself called by the church to officiate in that capacity: for as every body expresses its will by its mouth, so the christian body expresses its will by its mouth, or tongue, which we have seen is the person officiating for the time being, with the consent of the body, as the president, speaker, or mouth of the assembly.

No person can, with propriety or any authority, introduce any thing into the assembly, can propose any subject, ask any question, make any motion, take part in any discussion or examination without leave of the president. Hence the necessity of having seniors, or the most experienced, prudent, and grave persons in an assembly selected for this office: and so many of them as will not leave the church to the hazard of being unorganized at any meeting, either by the sickness, absence, or any failure of one president.

In the conducting of the worship, few difficulties, if any, can occur in ordinary meetings; not so, however, in the reading, examination, or discussion of any portion of scripture, question, or case of discipline. Right reason says that when the president of any meeting, or any member through him and with his consent, introduces any topic of consideration, and declares it a proper subject of deliberation for the time being; in the consideration of that subject the following rules of order ought to be regarded:—

1. That no member speak more than once on the subject, without special leave of the president.

2. That in speaking upon the subject, he always speak to the point; and that he never impugns or arraigns the motives from which any thing is said by any member who may occupy the attention of the meeting.

3. That every speaker regard, in all his remarks, the character of the christian institution, and consider the christian congregation as the house of the living God, the temple of the Holy Spirit; and that, therefore, the utmost gravity, dignity, and solemnity, should appear in all that he says, both in matter and manner.

A few words on each of these rules of decorum shall close the present essay.

The reason of the first rule is, "Let all things be done to the edification of the congregation." If, therefore, one person speak repeatedly

on the same subject, the congregation will be deprived of the full advantage of the knowledge and understanding of all its members. Again, if a brother reply to another who may differ from him, the deliberation is converted into a debate which ought never to be introduced into a worshipping assembly. Besides, when any brother gives his views upon any subject, and another differs from him in any respect, he ought not to feel himself bound more than any other member to sustain them. It is the privilege of the church to act from the best lights she can command on all occasions, and this every speaker should feel; and therefore, except when the correction of some mistake as to his meaning becomes necessary, each speaker should wish to give place, until all who have any light to offer shall have concisely and fully given their views to the congregation.

The philosophy of the second rule is, that all suspicioning of the motives, all surmizing of evil or sinister designs, is expressly condemned both in the letter and spirit of the christian institution. It is ungentlemanly to ascribe any improper motive to a member of political society; and it is as unchristian among the disciples of Christ to impugn or suspect the motives of any brother of aught that is unbecoming, as it is ungentlemanly among the citizens of this present evil world to impute an unworthy motive to a fellow-citizen.

The grounds and reasons of the third rule is, that all levity, all frivolity, all jesting, smiling, or any thing in the common parlance of the street, counting-house, forum, or fireside, is beneath the dignity of the author of the christian religion, and of that institution of which he is the head. Let every thing be done with decency and order, that the Lord may be honored by his worshippers and his people sanctified through the truth.

Let no one, however, suppose that the christian disciples must in all their meetings assume such a form, or place themselves under such circumstances as a necessary part of their worship on every *first* day as to make the observance of these rules necessary. But when any matter of deliberation, examination, or discipline shall call for an expression of the views, or call forth all the knowledge and experience of the congregation, these rules are to be regarded as the *dicta* of reason enlightened by the maxims of the New Testament. Indeed, the observance of the institutions of prayer, praise, the supper, reading, teaching, exhortations from those qualified and called forward by the congregation, are the usaal and ordinary matters which ought to engage the attention of the disciples on the Lord's day.

EDITOR.

DR. GILL *vs.* THE ANTI-REFORMERS.

THERE is not a Baptist writer of any notoriety in England or America, and I am sure there were none among the Waldenses, who do not lay down such principles, and argue from them in such a way as to condemn all the opposition from our Baptist brethren in reference to all our efforts. But the misfortune is, that few men are consistent with themselves; and while pleading for one object, they will reason

from principles as undeniably plain and authoritative, which they do lose sight of, and sometimes impugn when writing or reasoning for another object. Such is the influence of the will upon the understanding, that not unfrequently it presents the same subject, principle, or fact in the most contradictory points of view. Dr. Gill and Andrew Fuller frequently state and contend for such principles as subvert all their own reasonings on other matters; but in one matter they are unanimous —*i. e.* in condemning the principles from which all our Baptist opponents act. In this matter they are wholly with us, though in other respects theoretically they are with them.

EDITOR.

Essex, Va. May 24, 1831.

BROTHER CAMPBELL:

AS so much has been said by your opponents throughout the United States, as far as we have heard from them, of the orthodoxy of Dr. Gill and Andrew Fuller, I have spent some time in reading some of the writings of these idols of the Baptists, and have been astonished at their conduct towards you and all those who are advocating the restoration of the ancient order of things. Their conduct reminds me of the Pharisees that opposed the Messiah; they extol the writings of Moses, and scoff the sayings and doings of Jesus. Messrs. Clopton, Noel, and Co. are continually crying up these men's opinions, and charging us with innovation upon the established customs and opinions of the fathers; setting these men up as the head of the christian church. No wonder they should call every one that owns no man as master but Jesus Christ, heretics, schismatics, Campbellites, *et cetera*. The reason is obvious, if we apply the old adage, "They measure our corn with their bushel."

I will now send you a few of the sayings of these "fathers," that society, *especially the Baptists*, may see who are innovators, heretics, schismatics, &c. &c.

In a pamphlet published seventy-eight years ago, by Dr. Gill, I find the following sayings, which if you think merit a place in the Harbinger, you can use your own pleasure respecting the whole of this communication—

In opposing what is called Apostolic tradition to support infant baptism, he says:

"If it is founded upon scripture, then not upon tradition; and if upon tradition, then not upon scripture: if it is a scriptural business, then not a traditional one; and if a traditional one, then not a scriptural one: if it can be *proved by scripture, that's enough;* it has no need of tradition: but if it cannot be proved by that, a cart load of traditions will not support it."

Again: "We take the Bible to be the only authentic, perfect, and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice: we allow of no other head and law-giver but one, that is Christ; we deny that any man, or set of men, have any power to make laws in his house, or to decree rites

and ceremonies to be observed by his people; no, not Apostles themselves, uninspired: and this gentleman, [speaking of his opponent] *out of this controversy*, is of the same mind with us; who asserts the above things we do; and affirms, without the least hesitation, that what is ordained by the Apostle, without any precept from the Lord, or any particular direction of the Holy Spirit, is not at all obligatory, as a law, upon the consciences of christians. Even *the Apostles* had no dominion over the faith and practice of christians but what was given them by the *special presence and Spirit of Christ*, the only lawgiver, Lord, and sovereign of the church. They were to teach only the things which he commanded them; and whatever they enjoined under the influence of that Spirit, was to be considered and obeyed as the injunctions of Christ: but if they enjoined any thing in the church, without the peculiar influence and direction of this Spirit,—that is, as merely fallible and unassisted men—in that case, their injunctions had no authority over conscience, and every man's own reason had authority to examine and discuss their injunctions, as they approved themselves to his private judgment, to observe them or not.* Should we grant what you ask, [says he to his antagonist] that the church in the present age has the same authority and power as the church in the Apostles' age, considered as being under any immediate and extraordinary guidance of the Holy Spirit, what will you gain by it? This same authority and power is, you see, sir, really *no power nor authority at all.*"

Dr. Gill now replies to his opponent in the following language:—"The controversy between us and our brethren on this head, is the same as between Papists and Protestants about *tradition*, and between the Church of England and Dissenters, about the church's *power to decree rites and ceremonies;* viz. *Whether Christ is the sole head and law-giver in his church,* or *whether any set of men have a power to set aside, alter, and change any laws of his*, or *prescribe new ones?* If the latter, then we own it is all over with us, and we ought to submit, and not carry on this dispute any further. But since we both profess to make the Bible our religion, and that only the rule of our faith and practice, let us unite upon this common principle, and reject every tradition of men, and all rites and ceremonies which Christ hath not enjoined on us; let us join in pulling down this prop of popery, and remove this scandal of the Protestant church." [Superexcellent!]

Again, speaking of baptizing, he says, "The rendering of the words *disciple, or proselyte all nations, baptizing them,*' will not help the cause of infant baptism; *for one cannot be a proselyte to any religion unless he is taught it, embraces, and professes it.*"

In speaking of the fitness of a candidate for baptism he tells us before whom the candidate is to appear. "Actual faith itself is not sufficient, without a profession of it; the man that has it ought to

* *It does appear to me from the conduct and writings of our opponents, that this doctrine is contended for, both theoretically and practically, or why oppose us in examining and discussing what approves itself to our private judgments, and use their authority to make us observ it?*

declare it to the satisfaction of the administrator, ere he admits him to the ordinance—(he cites) Acts viii. 36. 37."

In his reasons for the Baptists dissenting from the Church of England, he assigns the following as some:

"Though we are not against reading the scriptures in private and in public, yet we cannot approve of the manner the liturgy directs unto; namely, the reading it by *piecemeals*, by *bits* and *scraps*, so *mangled and curtailed* as the Gospels and Epistles. We see not why any part of the scripture be omitted; and the order of these being an invention of a Pope of Rome.

"Matrimony, which seems to favor the popish notion of making a sacrament of it; whereas it is a mere civil contract between a man and a woman, and in which *a minister has nothing to do*. Nor do we ever read of any priest or Levite that was ever concerned in the *solemnization of it between other persons, under the Old Testament*, or of any Apostle, or minister of the word, *under the New;* not to say any thing of the form of it.

"The burial of the dead; which is a mere civil action, and *belongs not to a gospel minister*, but to the relations of the deceased, or other neighbors, friends and acquaintances—Matth. viii. 21, 22. Nor is there any necessity for a place to be consecrated for such a purpose. Abraham and Sarah were buried in a cave—Deborah under an oak—Joshua in a field—Samuel in his house—and Christ in a garden. Nor do the scriptures ever make mention of any service being read, or of any divine worship being performed at the interment of the dead."

Again. "We cannot conform to the Church of *England*, because it is of a persecuting spirit. The reproaches and revilings which are daily cast upon us from the pulpit and the press, as well as in conversation, show the same."

Thus writes this good old Father. Who are innovators, heretics, schismatics, &c. according to his showing? Let the whole earth judge. You have often shown that our Baptist brethren have neither reason nor revelation to sustain them, and here their old father Gill condemns them. I wonder if they will take conviction from what he has said, as they will not hear what Jesus and his Apostles have said?

I intended giving some extracts from Fuller, but my sheet is nearly full. One only must suffice—

"Do you then suppose error to be innocent? The answer to this question must depend upon the cause from which it springs. If it arise from the want of natural power, or opportunity of obtaining evidence, it is mere mistake, and contains in it nothing of moral evil. But if it arise from prejudice, neglect, or an evil bias of heart, it is otherwise, and may endanger our eternal salvation."

If our brethren are opposing us from prejudice, as we have reason to believe, Fuller condemns them. They do manifestly neglect an opportunity, and show an evil bias of heart, by refusing us the liberty of free discussion in the houses of worship we have always been accustomed to, and for which many of us have paid our money; as

well the rights of conscience. They labor to prejudice others by a palpable misrepresentation of truth.—See the resolutions of the King and Queen Conference, which have been denied by every friend of reform; not one tittle of evidence has been produced to support them. If these brethren do not stand before the public as "false accusers," I am at a loss to understand the meaning of such words.

Yours in a precious Redeemer, T. M. HENLEY.

JEMIMA WILKINSON.

JEMIMA WILKINSON, the daughter of *Jeremiah Wilkinson*, an adherent of the society of Friends, was born in the town of Cumberland, Rhode Island, in the year 1751. She was the eighth child of her mother, an ardent Quaker, who died when Jemima was eight years old. She was left under the care of her sisters, her father being occupied on his farm so exclusively as to attend very little to the education of his children.

Jemima exhibited no peculiarity of character till her 16th year, except an unconquerable aversion to every thing called labor. No authority, persuasion, nor entreaty, could overcome her dislike to domestic attentions and industry. At 16 she had become a fine blooming girl, sprightly in her manners, comely in her person, and upon the whole possessed of no ordinary share of beauty. She took it into her head at this time to learn the profession of a tailoress. But that aversion to patient industry which made her solicitous of leaving home, caused her soon to abandon the business, and after ten months she returned back to her father's house. For the next seven years nothing occurred in her history worthy of note, except the many contests with her sisters about her passion for dress, and her total neglect of the affairs of the family.

In her native county of Providence, in 1774, there sprang up a sect of fanatics, called "New Lights," or "New Light Baptists." These enthusiasts went all for the Spirit, and received into their communion none but those who fancied themselves "to be constantly guided by an illumination directly from heaven." These after a time attracted the serious attention of some, and the curiosity of others. The meetings of this new sect Jemima frequented for a time, much to her reformation from gaiety and dress, though she never was possessed of such a share of their spirit as to qualify her for full membership. These fanatics soon died away: for when their fervor abated and reason returned the scheme was charmless in their eyes. Jemima, however, began from that time to think about religion and to read religious books. Novels, romances, poetry, and other light compositions constituted her former reading; but now the Bible and religious books occupied her attention, which diminished her passion for dress and visiting.

About midsummer, in the year 1775, she secluded herself from society, and kept her bed, complaining of ill health. Physicians found no symptoms of bodily ailment, and gave it as their opinion

that she was the subject of some strong delusion. In the September following she became still worse, talked of visions of angels and extraordinary visitations from the skies. Nightly watches were called in to attend upon her bed. Still the physician declared that she labor-under no corporeal malady. In the latter end of October, 1775, two neighboring women being in waiting upon her all night, who, far from superstition and fanaticism, were entertained by her for some time with marvellous details of visitations and visions; but being incredulous, and not regarding her in any other light than as laboring under some hallucination of the understanding, her tales passed for nothing. At length she pointed to the tremulous motion of the curtains of her bed in proof of the presence of the Lord. One of them, however, observed that this motion of the curtains was occasioned by pressing her feet against the wall at the foot of her bed. She vexed her attendants in this way till 11 oclock, when she appeared to fall into a slight slumber. She lay pale and motionless till after the clock struck 12. At this instant she arose, as if she had awakened from a long and refreshing sleep, and in an authoritative manner called for her apparel, affirming that she had passed the gates of death and was now risen from the dead. The family were awaked. The father regarding it as a whim, interposed his authority; but to no purpose. She declared she would obey none but the higher powers, obtained her clothing, and walked the house in apparently as good health as she ever enjoyed, though somewhat enfeebled and emaciated by her long confinement. When many of her neighbors came to see her and congratulate her upon her recovery, she denied that it was *Jemima Wilkinson* that they saw, and affirmed that Jemima's soul was in heaven, and that her body was reanimated by the power and spirit of Jesus Christ; that this was the second coming of Jesus Christ, who was to reign on earth a thousand years; that it was the eleventh hour, and the last call of mercy which should ever be made to the human race; that an inquiry was made in heaven, saying, "Who will go and preach to a dying world?" and she answered, "Here am I—send me!" Thereupon she immediately descended from heaven in order to pass through many trials and sufferings for the happiness of mankind. On leaving the realms of bliss it had been given her to choose whether she would be received back into heaven, bodily, at the end of the first ten days of her terrestrial residence, or remain on earth and encounter all difficulties and trials for the benefit of mankind for one thousand years, and then receive a corporeal translation into heaven. She informed her friends that she had chosen to reign on earth a thousand years, and that the *tabernacle* which she inhabited was immortal, and at the close of a thousand years would be taken up in a cloud to glory. She protested that those who refused to believe these things would be in the state of the unbelieving Jews who rejected the counsel of God against themselves.

She soon began to preach these things of herself. Her friends were vexed with her arrogance and obstinacy, and others were intimidated by her set manner of speech, the firmness of her voice, the

inflexibility of her countenance, and the steady and intense glare of her eyes. No one at first believed in her preposterous pretensions. She attended all the meetings in her vicinity, and declared that all earthly relationships were with her at an end. She called herself "*the Universal Friend*," and recognized no person as a relative; disowned her father and all her kindred as not now standing in such relations to her.

Her fame spread abroad into remote places, and she was invited to visit them. In her perambulations she visited Newport, Providence, North and South Kingston in Rhode Island, and some principal places in Connecticut and Massachusetts. She rejected all the peculiarities of all sects—sacraments, creeds, ceremonies, all church government, and "most of the leading doctrines of christianity." She made a number of proselytes, first of the poor and ignorant, and afterwards of the better informed and wealthy. To the conversion of the wealthy she turned her whole attention. Several joined her society, and very large contributions were made for her use. Once she had a project on foot for going to England to preach her gospel there; but really in hopes of finding a husband in a British officer with whom she had got acquainted at Newport; and as an outfit for this religious mission, large donations were made. One of her followers contributed 1000 dollars for this religious purpose: But the death of her paramour, reported in a newspaper which fell into her hands just as she was about to sail, defeated the whole project; and telling her friends that she was advised in a vision to take care of her flock at home, she continued to proclaim in New England.

A sort of joint stock, or community of goods, was next preached to her disciples, and efforts were made to set it on foot. The rich did not so well relish this proposition, but the poor extolled it as the perfection of religion. However, to please them both she made the rich keepers of the stock, and the richest man was treasurer for the community, and each was left to contribute as much or as little as he pleased to this treasury. Whatever was necessary for the wants or wishes of Jemima was cheerfully communicated, for her demands were always made in these words, "*The Lord has need of this thing.*" No one of her society dared to refuse such a demand as this, by which means Jemima lived in the most luxurious style.

She established several societies in different parts of the country, and her followers were so devoted to her, that no errors, no failures in working miracles which she attempted, no impostures, no actual crimes in which she was detected, could cause them to abandon her institutions. Not theft, attempted murder, an effort to walk upon the water, nor a pretence to raise to life a living man placed in a coffin as if dead, (in all of which acts she was fairly and fully detected,) could weaken the confidence of her admirers, or cause them to desert her standard. Several wealthy families were ruined in their circumstances, and rendered ridiculous in society through their persevering devotion to this "*Universal Friend.*"

When the symptoms of approaching dissolution began to appear,

and to threaten the rapid flight of her *thousand years*, some of her friends interpreted them into proofs of the falling of her tabernacle only, and not as if indicative that she should go the way of all the earth. They could not brook the idea that she would literally die. But no fanaticism can change the course of nature. Jemima felt she must die, and began to inform her attendants that she must soon leave them. Towards the evening of the day of her death, she said, "My friends, I must soon depart: I am going: this night I leave you."—She died about 2 o'clock in the morning of July 1, 1819, aged 68 years.

A few of her flock expected that her disease would terminate her earthly career, and were prepared for the event; but the major part of them could not, and did not believe that she was dead when it was reported to them. They regarded the report as an insult to their understanding; and when they actually saw the corpse they were at first shocked exceedingly, it is true; but were rallied by the representation of the interested part of the fraternity that she had only left them for a while, and that her spirit was about to become resident among them and to be the guardian angel of all her followers. They refused to bury the body; and, indeed, all the usual rites paid to the dead were dispensed with, and most of her followers knew not what use was made of the body, or where it was finally placed. The society has diminished rapidly since her death, in defiance of all the representations of her deceived and deceiving followers. She bequeathed a considerable property, which she obtained in New York, to some of her confederates, by whom her authority was maintained, though she had so often failed to redeem her pledges and promises to work miracles.

She was regarded by her followers in the light of a divinity, and her body as the tabernacle of the Lord and his Spirit. On her principal followers she bestowed the most extravagant titles: One was "the Prophet Daniel;" another, "the Prophet Elijah." In return they paid to her all homage, ascribed to her divine powers, and regarded her as the second appearance of Jesus Christ.

This sketch of her history I have gleaned from a volume of more than 200 pages, written by *David Hudson*, of New York, in which is a pretty full account of the rise, progress, and conclusion of her ministry.

This we give to our readers as another instance of the facility with which many become the prey of the most extravagant impostors, and wild delusions. No story can be invented, however romantic, unreasonable, and ridiculous, for which some believers cannot be found; and the pertinacity with which the deluded cleave to these romances is in the ratio of their absurdity. The less plausible, or rather the more incredible the tale, the stronger the faith of the infatuated. The believers in Jemima's mission had their visions of angels, impulses, and illuminations from heaven, so frequent and so unambiguous, that they lived and died in the full assurance of faith in her mission and pretensions.

Perhaps few preachers on the continent could boast of more "seals to their ministry," of more thorough converts, of more persevering believers, than could this preacheress of one of the most barefaced lies ever told. So dangerous it is to expect new impulses, visions, and revelations from heaven, that where the expectation is entertained there is no *hitherto* can be fixed as the ultimatum of folly and madness to which men and women may be driven. EDITOR.

IT may appear strange to some that on the subject of converting the world we can quote with approbation a passage from the work of John Howard Hinton, quoted, commended and extolled by the Editor of the "Christian Index." But this cannot appear more strange to any person than it does to us, that Mr. Brantly should extol these ideas, coming from England, which were in substance exhibited in the 1st volume of the Christian Baptist, and, together with our other remarks on the same subject, reprobated, condemned as detrimental to the conversion of the world! I must object to some of the phrases in the following extract, for reasons well known to most of our readers; but with the scope and design of the whole I am not only well pleased, but have for years contended for the same course, as the only effectual moral means of converting the world. Make every citizen a soldier, officers are still necessary: but make every citizen a soldier of the cross, and a preacher of righteousness. I have no doubt but if many of our views were published in a new style in England, and printed by such judicious men as Lincoln and Edmunds, of Boston, even Mr. Brantly could, with all good conscience, quote and recommend them. But this *Brooke county* is in Western Virginia, and we cannot remove it, nor remove from it. Not even a call as loud as my friend Brantly's could place us in Second-street, Philadelphia.

ED. M. H.

A LITTLE BOOK MAY PROVE A GREAT BLESSING.

We have read with deep emotion a small work, by the Rev. John Howard Hinton, a Baptist preacher in England, on the all-absorbing subject of REVIVALS. We hasten to acquaint our readers with the existence of such a book, and with the further fact, that those judicious publishers, Lincoln & Edmunds, of Boston, have made a very neat American edition of it, in about 100 pages. Mr. Hinton has touched the true spring of useful action in the Christian church; and has developed with much clearness the genuine method of extending the influence of Gospel principles. He does not undertake to show the means by which an extraordinary excitement may be produced for a time, nor to lay down rules for the direction of those special events which distinguish the periods usually denominated revivals; but his plan is to point out the easiest and the surest way of making true religion universal. We shall allow him to speak for himself.

Christian Index.

HOME LABOR.

"You will not suppose me to depreciate for a moment either of

those most important and obligatory means of aiding the progress of religion, the stated ministry of the Gospel, or missions to the heathen; but place even them in comparison with universal endeavor, and the result will be greatly in its favor. Missionaries and ministers are comparatively few, and provided with difficulty; individual effort brings hundreds of thousands of laborers into the field in a moment. The support of ministers and missionaries involves (however unwillingly) a large annual expenditure; but for every christian to labor at home, costs absolutely nothing. Missionaries have to make great sacrifices, to run great risks, and often to fill an early grave; while individual effort involves no hazard, bereaves no parent, afflicts no family. A man sent abroad goes as a stranger, with a thousand impediments to encounter; in seeking to convert our neighbors and our friends, our way is open, our countenances are known, our language is understood, our influence is felt, our intention is appreciated. Private christians have many advantages over ministers of the gospel, even in the most favored circumstances. The one speak in virtue of their office, and often under a degree of suspicion as to their sincerity; the other can speak from no motive but unfeigned love. The one can address their hearers but occasionally; the other may do it frequently, and follow up their instructions by almost incessant watchfulness and admonition. The one speak as comparative strangers; the other may employ the more touching eloquence of social kindness, of ardent friendship, and perhaps of fraternal or paternal love. The one can speak only to those who choose to attend on their ministry; the other are scattered through society in all its paths, and can carry instruction and reproof to the heedless and abandoned. Had there been nothing instituted, therefore, but the public preaching of the gospel, whether at home or abroad, the easiest, most extensive, and most effectual means of converting the world would have been overlooked. Superficial observers might have conceived that little result could have been expected, from even a multitude of such feeble efforts as those of individual christians, in the same way as one might at first exclaim, Who would think of setting bounds to the sea by a sand bank? but He who knew that grains of sand form the only effectual barrier to the raging waters, discerned too that grains of salt would best season the corrupted world. He has, indeed, done well in instituting a public ministry; but the consummateness of His wisdom lies in evoking the individual energy of his people. 'Ye are the salt of the earth; ye are the light of the world.' "

PERSONAL EFFORT.

"'*Ye are the salt of the earth.*' It is as though He had said, 'By my grace I have fitted you, and in my good pleasure I have appointed you, to be the instruments of converting the world. Be ye *the salt of the earth.* Every where let your influence be felt, and your capabilities exerted.' The text necessarily assumes this aspect, because the result anticipated implies and requires the voluntary effort of the followers of Christ. The corrupt earth will not be seasoned by the mere fact of christians being scattered through it, without their en-

deavors to instruct, to convince and to persuade. The Lord's declaration, therefore, must be our directory. Let us charge it upon ourselves solemnly, if we are His disciples indeed, that it be with us an object of real and practical endeavor to do every thing that can be done for the conversion of sinners. We are not called upon merely to cherish a desire, however fervent, that sinners may be converted, or even to pray, with whatever enlargement, for this blessing; neither are we to content ourselves with remote and indirect efforts for this end, such as supporting the ministry of the gospel, or promoting missions to the heathen: that which is demanded is our *personal labor*. We are individually summoned to use the direct means of conversion; to be the salt of the earth.

"The means of conversion are of great variety. Among them undoubtedly may be reckoned endeavors to circulate the Holy Scriptures, and to put into the hands of every man the Volume which is able to make him wise unto salvation. But this is not all, nor even chief. The intention of Christ, as expressed in this passage, plainly is, that the actual character of His disciples should be brought into complete contact with that of ungodly men; for *they* are the *salt* of the earth. The words lead us of necessity, therefore, to the use of such means of conversion as express this character; namely, to conversation of an instructive, convincing, or persuasive tendency; to serious admonition, or even pointed reproof; to affectionate prayer, and the subserviency to this object of all the intercourse of life, as the writing of letters, occasional visits, offices of kindness, and the influence of relationship or domestic association. It is thus, by direct and personal effort, that a disciple of Christ should seek the conversion of sinners.

"And this should be the attitude of *every* disciple. None are exempt from the appointment, none are destitute of the qualification. None are without fitness for the work, and none are at liberty to decline it. It may easily be said by some, My ability is very small: and without entering into any argument on this point, I only say, that whatever it may be, it is enough, with God's blessing, to convert sinners. Besides, does not Christ know what it is? Is it not such as he has given you? Is it not such as he requires to be employed? Do you presume to say that what he has prepared for beneficial action is unfit for it? or that what he demands for this purpose shall be refused? However small a portion, you still are a portion of the salt of the earth: see that you act as such. The less your talent, the more need of activity. Beware lest your plea of incompetency be but a cloak for your indolence. Do not so much covet the ability of others, as show diligence in the application of your own.

"It may with equal eas be said of others, My station is obscure, and my influence small. Granted: but you will also admit, on the other hand, that however narrow your circle may be, it is a circle of some dimensions that you occupy. You do not stand alone upon the earth. You have *some* relatives, acquaintance, and neighbors. And are they all pious? If you were to try earnestly, could you not reach any who are living without God? Behold, then, your duty. Labor for the conversion of these unhappy persons; and wrap yourself no longer in the delusion, that in this direction Christ can require and expect nothing *from you*.

"It may with truth be alleged by a third class that they are excessively busy, and are thrown into situations in life which demand all their time and all their power; they surely may leave the work of converting sinners to more leisure hands. Yes; if you are willing to abandon your hope of salvation, and to give up your interest in Christ; but *not else*. If you are His disciples, you are also the salt of the earth; and not the busiest man in the world is at liberty to relinquish one part of the character, and to imagine that he can retain the other. But the allegation supposed is, in all probability, truth exaggerated into the character of falsehood. You either have, or might have, some leisure in the early morning; and you allot the evening hours to the agreeable relaxation of domestic or social intercourse. Does a feeling of surprise, to

say no more, start up in your bosom at the mention of these things? You are upon the verge then of discovering, that it is not time you want, but inclination? Be assured that this is the fact; and that, however closely engaged, you ought to find, and may find, if you are disposed, means of specific exertion for the salvation both of your domestic inmates, your acquaintance, and your neighbors; while a similar aim may run through even the busiest of those busy hours, which, so far from becoming a plea for your total exemption from labor, ought to be regarded as furnishing you with incessant opportunities of promoting this blessed end.

"The duty of laboring directly and individually for the conversion of sinners is, in a word, one from which none of the followers of Christ can be excused. He knows the varied talents and circumstances of all; and comprehends them all in the declaration, 'Ye are the salt of the earth.'

"Further: If endeavors to convert ungodly men should be recognized as a duty by every disciple of Christ, it should also be esteemed a duty of the highest moment. Of our many duties, none are without importance; but in this respect all are not equal. Our first duties are those which relate to our own salvation; and the next are those which relate to the salvation of others. By the immense magnitude of the object, and its direct reference to the glory of God and the highest happiness of our fellow-creatures, these take the decided precedence of all duties respecting the temporal interest either of ourselves or others. I am very well aware how often the callings of life will allow but a comparatively small portion of time to be applied to it; but the same may be said of the cultivation of personal piety, which is nevertheless our first duty. What we mean by this is, that the attainment of this end should hold the highest place in our desires; that it should be our chief aim, and that all other affairs should be so arranged as to afford us the amplest possible opportunities of pursuing it. So when we say that endeavors for the conversion of sinners form the second class of our duties, we mean that, next to our own salvation, we should feel more concerned about this than any other object; that it should be actually second among the great aims of life; and that our affairs should be so ordered as to allow us the utmost practicable opportunity of promoting it. We mean that when a christian asks himself, For what great ends do I live? he should be able to say, First for the good of my own soul; next for the conversion of others; and only after this, for the diligent prosecution of my worldly calling, and efforts of temporal benevolence.

"No duty, rightly understood, clashes with another. And as it happens with our first duty, that of securing our own salvation, so it is with our second, that of seeking the salvation of others, that an attention to it requires no interference with a due regard to earthly affairs. While we are diligent in business, as, on the one hand, we may be also fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; so, on the other, we may be animated by a deep concern for the spiritual welfare of those around us, and be ready to embrace every opportunity of advancing it, as a matter far more important than any secular advantage. And nothing short of this is the state of feeling and of action to which our Lord calls us, when he says, 'Ye are the salt of the earth.' "

PHILIP on the Co-operation of Churches is substituted for my Nos. II. & III. on that subject. They were written by him at my request, because of engagements which called me from home.

ERRATUM.

IN No. 6, page 242, line from bottom 22d, after was, insert NOT —"*was not overruled.*"

MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

J Wilson, Beeler's Station, Va. paid vol 1. J Mulkey, Athens, Ten. vol 1 and 2 for C Metcalf and himself. O Welsh, Mount Pleasant, Va. vol 1 for W Slaughter and W C Clark, also, 1 dollar vol 2 for himself. N H Turner, Locust Creek, Va. vol 1 for J H Atkinson and A Mills; also vol 2 for L Turner, D Diggs, and T Johnson. W A Seranton, Rochester, N. Y. vol 1 for G Thurstin, C G Hill, and M Wilson; also, vols 1 and 2 for M Thurstin. A Graham, Hartsville, Ten. vols 1 and 2. W Hopewood, Bellborough, Ten. vols 1 and 2 for S Bigham, and vol 1 for H Bagley; also, vol 2 for J Yowel, G Blackwell and W Usrey. J K Speere. Bellborough, Ten. vol 1 and 2 for D Yancey, and vol 1 for J Billington. R Seaton, Jeffersontown, Ky. vol 2 for R Welsh, J Mills, E B Garnett, J A Sweney, J W Tyler, and himself. W R Cole, Wilmington, O. vol 1 for L Reed and J Rulon, and vol 2 for W Hibbin, J Shackley, and J Wilson. O Owens, Cincinnati, O. vol 2 for H Hathaway, and U Vanpelt. J Letherman, Canonsburg, Pa. vol 1. L Browning, Bethany, Va. vol 2. S Curtis, Stratford, Con. vol 2. J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store, Va. vol 2 for P Hurt, R Sanders, and 1 dollar for F Lester. R Thompson, Georgetown, Ky. vol 2 for Mrs. B Smith, J Gaines, R Hurt, J W Grant, and E Johnson. T Bullock, Rees' Cross Roads, Ky. vol 2 for J Milchum, D Craig, W L Grady, P T Fisher, C Graves, J Castleman, J Sullivan, S Nuckles, S G Henry, J Collins, and himself; also, vols 1 and 2 for N Hayden, and S P Menzey, and vol 1 for G Carter. S Clack, Bloomfield, Ky. vol 1 and 2, and 1 dollar for S Carpenter. M P Wills, Fulton, Mo. vol 1 for — Peele, Esq. and 1 dollar for A Miller; also, vol 2 for J P Ewing. J Vankirk and H Langley, Washington, Pa. vol 2. G B Craft, Merrittstown, Pa. vol 2. C Dailey, Finleyville, Pa. vol 2 for J Moore and himself. A Sutton, Washington, Pa. vol 1 for J Denney, and vol 2 for C Wheeler. J Bowman, Perryopolis, Pa. vol. 2. A Morrison, C Forwards, Mary Ogle, N N Bruce, Somerset, Pa. vol 2. Mary S Graft, Somerset, Pa. paid 1 dollar for J Yonkins, and vol 2 for herself. W Shanks, Brownsville, Pa. vol 2. G F H Crockett, Lexington, Ky. vol 2 for H Wallace, B Steele, F Branham, R Ramsey, and A Dunlap. H Edwards, Bloomfield, Ky. vols 1 and 2. J Young, Brownville, Ten. vol. 1 for W Henderson, and J Booth; also, for E S Tappan, vol 2, 50 cents. G W Watts, Wattsborough, Va. vol 1 2 for R B Wilson, and vol 2 for J D Tinsdale, A Crawford, and himself. O H Tucker, Jamestown, Va. vol 2 for S H Pettus and himself. A Reynolds and Drusilla Carter, vols 1 and 2, and J Cooper, Washington, Pa. vol. 2. J Mitchell, Bentleysville, Pa. vols 1 and 2. J Smith, Georgeville, Mi. vol. 1 and 2. T Rucker, Murfreesborough, Ten. vol. 1 for C Parks, W Smith, T Rucker, Sen. and himself; and vol 2 for T J Nivean. J Curtwright, Montgomery, Ga. vol 1 for J Park, P Riley, and himself; also, vol 1 and 2 for W Walker. S G Earle, Earle's Store, S. C. vols 1 and 2 for R S C Forster and Elizabeth R Earle; also, vol 2 for S Vandiver. J Lydick, Indiana, Pa. vol 1, and 1 dollar for vol 2 for S Howe; also, vol2 for himself. J Rogers, Carlisle, Ky. vol 1 and 2 for O H Stout, and vol 2 for H Dinsmore, J Hall, G Bryant. J T Johnson, Georgetown, Ky. vols 1 and 2 for S Hatch, and 1 dollar for D Bradford, vol 2. J Wright, Jonesborough, Ten. vols 1 and 2. M P Wills, Fulton, Mo. vol 1, and 1 dollar for vol 2 for S Hopson, and vol 2 for G Maupin. E S Bush, Rising Sun, Ind. vol 2 for D B Barnhart, and vol 1 and 2 for J B Craft and himself. W Hopper, Hopper's Tan Yard, Ky. vol 1. W Bootwright, Richmond, Va. vol. 1 for J Bosher, Eliza Jenkins, W Calfield, G Massie, N Brown, R Vaughn, R Ryland, and vol 2 for W Bootwright, J Bootwright, W Dabney, C H Hyde. J Woodson, G Hanes, T C Howard, J P Tyler, J Winn, W Bosher, G R Myers, T J Glenn, B Jones, T H Fox, E Redd, J Shook, B F Lester, C Carter, O Ellison, Mrs. M Kinnard, M Walthall, J L Cary, J L Nelson, R Parrish, D Baker, J B Bragg, W D Wrenn. W B Clarke, J Winston, C Tally, M L Jones, N Brown, R Ryland, W H Johnson, M W Webber, H J Anderson, J T Anderson, J Goss, N Branham, S C Harris, J Tyler, H N Coleman.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 7. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, JULY* 4, 1831. Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

THE WHOLE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.

THIS dialogue will not be a substitute for what is written in the 2d volume of the *Christian Baptist* on "the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men;" nor does it proceed upon the supposition that the reader is fully acquainted with all that is written in that series of essays upon this subject; but it places the whole subject in a new light before the reader, and will develope the subject more fully with a reference to all the systems of the sects.

It may be supposed that we are too sanguine should we think that we can reconcile all the conflicting creeds and their admirers to the views about to be submitted; and yet we entertain the opinion, and it is but an opinion, that we can reconcile many of the different sects; of those, too, who boast so much of being the subjects of special operations, to what we would call, with all due deference to those differing from us, the doctrine of the Apostles upon this subject.

We are greatly deceived in our reasonings, as well as in our apprehensions of the fair import of the sayings of the Apostles, if we cannot show to all who will give us an impartial or candid hearing, that the views to be submitted are more conducive to the true conversion of sinners to God, to the spirit of true piety in the converted, to the holiness and happiness of all disciples, than are the tenets and views which we intend to undermine and refute in the following dialogue. If their tendency be not to ascribe more glory to God, to produce more peace and joy in the human heart, and more good will to all mankind than the views to which they are opposed, then let them be repudiated. But, gentle reader, judge nothing before the time; hear the whole, then embrace or reject them.—ED.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT—*Part I.*

AUSTIN AND TIMOTHY.

Austin—Is there no way of settling the public mind on the nature and degrees of influence which the Holy Spirit exercises upon the human mind in converting and sanctifying men?

Timothy—Certainly the writings dictated by that Spirit settle questions.

A.—In the sacred writings these questions may be settled, but the christian public are unsettled, and greatly confounded through the conflicting theories of spiritual influences and operations. The most sincere hearted are in doubts, and the most candid are yet inquiring what the scriptures teach concerning both the nature and degrees of influence exerted by that agent in the salvation of men.

T.—This is true of many other subjects which are clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures. Our questions are not discussed there, because many of them are foolish and untaught. Men have long explored both Testaments to find infant baptism and confirmation clearly taught. But who has ever found a hint on these topics in the divine books! Yet the candid and sincere hearted are in doubts and difficulties on these subjects. We have sought out many inventions, and we go to the book in expectation of finding them settled there. But God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor his ways as our ways. He teaches us by his messengers, as he has taught us by his works; nothing in the abstract—every thing in the concrete.

A.—But this does not extricate us from the mazes in which we have strayed. Can nothing be done to relieve us from the influences of these pernicious theories? Can we not reason ourselves out of our false reasonings?

T.—The best reasoning is that which leads us to the Oracles and turns our attention to the simplicity of the divine teaching. To reason ourselves out of false reasonings is not so easy as many suppose. We have one set of premises in our minds, and another before our eyes; and, therefore, our conclusions are very often erroneous; and because of the confusion in our premises we cannot detect the errors in our inferences. To illustrate this I will make an experiment on your self, and shall begin with asking you, What are your conclusions on the *nature* of that influence which the Holy Spirit exercises in converting men? We may speak of the *degrees* again.

A.—To this I have no objections; for my mind vascilates on that subject, and while I incline to my old theory of *divine assistance*, or spiritual operations, independent of what is written, I am not able accurately to define it, nor to maintain it with confidence against some objections which I have found in your essays on Metaphysical Regeneration; but upon the whole premises, I am rather of the opinion that there is some divine influence either accompanying, or apart from the word which makes it, and without which it is not, an effectual means of salvation.

T.—Can you give no name to, nor definition of, that power or influence? or is it an indistinct and indescribable influence of which you can form no idea? for, remember, if you can form no idea of it, it is impossible to think of it, or to speak of it intelligibly.

A.—I confess the difficulty which I feel in giving it a name, because my ideas of power or influence are limited by what I see around me; and I acknowledge that there are but two sorts of power of which I can form distinct ideas, and on which I can converse with some degree of confidence. These are what are usually called *natural*, *physical*, and *moral* power.

T.—Perhaps your third sort of power is a combination of these two, as you can have no distinct idea of any influence which is not in its nature either natural or moral.

A.—I would, upon the whole, call it *spiritual* power, and suppose it to be neither purely moral nor purely natural, nor even a simple combination of these two; but a species of power which is neither angelic nor human, but divine.

T.—This helps not our conceptions, and I must confess I can form no idea of a power spiritual, which is neither moral nor natural, nor a combination of the two. To speak of a *spiritual* power without some meaning attached to the word, is only to impose upon ourselves.

A.—I will therefore define it. It is a power operating directly on the spirit of man, without any thing between it and the Spirit of God. It is the naked Spirit of God operating upon the naked spirit of man, without any instrument or means, moral or physical. This is what I call spiritual power. Let me define the three sorts of power of which I have spoken. There is physical power—that is an agent operating through the laws of nature; there is moral power;—that is an agent operating through moral law or through moral means; and there is spiritual power;—that is a spiritual agent operating upon a spirit without any law or means moral or natural. And all this is proved in an ancient and common adage—"God works by means, and he works without them." He employs two sorts of means, physical and moral; and he acts, like himself, *spiritually*, when he employs no means at all.

T.—I understand you now, I presume, full as well as you understand yourself. I apprehend your definition of spiritual power, and think you have been more fortunate in expressing yourself than any person I have met with on your side of the question. Will you allow me to suggest an illustration of your three sorts of power, that you may be satisfied that I do understand you.

A.—I will thank you for it.

T.—Senex had a son whom he wished to bring into his house. He first reasoned with him, and presented motives to induce him to come in. These failed; and he called for a rope, which he threw around him. By this he atempted to draw him into the house, but the rope broke. Then he walked out himself, and seized him with his own naked hands, and pulled him in. The first represents your moral power; the second, your physical power; and the third effort represents your spiritual power.

A.—I cannot find an objection to your illustration as respects the *nature* of these powers; though I think your representation of physical power makes it too mechanical, and your illustration of spiritual power makes it too much like compulsion.

T.—Let me have a better one, then, if you can. I only aim at showing you that I apprehend your spiritual power, as contradistinguished from those which are already well defined.

A.—I shall take the same case, and only suppose that when Senex had reasoned with his son he was willing to come in, but was unable.

Then his father handed him his cane, and by it aided him in walking in; but this still being inadequate, he laid aside his cane and took him by the hand and led him in.

T.—This still exhibits the three powers in the same light, only you have two of them successfully applied; namely, the moral and the spiritual; while I represent the latter only as successfully applied. The difference, then, is not in the *nature* of the power, but in the *success* accompanying its exertion.

A.—Agreed. You understand me, and that is all I wish. You will, therefore, please consider whether such a power is not taught in the scriptures; and is not in the nature of things necessary to the conversion of men.

T.—My dear sir, if you were to distribute and classify power into animal, mechanical, physical, moral, and spiritual, and could define your own distinctions with all logical and rhetorical accuracy and eloquence, it affects not the nature of the great question on which you proposed an interview, viz.—*the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men.* The present salvation is not a change of body, nor of perception, memory, judgment, imagination, reason; not of the intellectual and animal; but of the *moral* nature of man. Christ came not to make new men and redeem them, but to redeem and save such as we are by nature. Our ruin is not in our senses nor in our intellectual faculties, but in our moral character and relations. The enlargement of our powers, physical, animal, or intellectual, would neither contribute to our purity nor our happiness. It is a moral revolution, a moral reformation, a moral change, which is essential to the salvation of men. The means must therefore be moral, unless we can think that physical causes can produce moral effects.

A.—I am not opposed to the necessity of such a change, but to your *name* of it. Call it a *spiritual* change and I agree with you in all you have said.

T.—Spiritual change and moral change are both terms of our own adoption. But as you have defined *spiritual* power to be a power without means, natural or moral, we cannot, *in that sense*, use the term in reference to this change, as all must confess that means numerous and powerful have been employed in effecting the salvation of men. Sacrifices, altars, priests, temples, prophets, apostles, evangelists, words, writings, institutions, ordinances, laws, &c. &c. are found in the vast variety of means employed in effecting this salvation. The power is not spiritual, in your sense of it, which effects this change. And let me add, whatever may be said of God's working spiritually, or without means, in reference to any other universe prior to, or separate from this one, to which our persons and our Bibles belong, one thing is most obvious and indisputable—he always works by means in this empire.

A.—But it is more to the glory of God to work without means than with them?

T.—Of this, perhaps, we are both bad judges. It is enough for us to know that God has been more glorified by Jesus Christ than he

could have been without his humiliation unto death, and that he has always employed means in the creation, government, and redemption of men. And for my part, I must consider the loaf upon my table as much the gift of God as the manna in the pots of Israel. Both came from God; but the former more circuitously, and to us more ingeniously and curiously than the latter. More of God is seen in giving me a loaf in the usual way, than was seen in a shower of manna. Power was most conspicuous in the manna, but wisdom and power are equally displayed in the loaf. In one sentence, means are employed in bringing man into the world; in sustaining, preserving, and comforting him while in it; and in taking him out of it. All natural good is received by natural means, and all moral good by moral means. So decree all reason and all experience.

A.—It is reason we are now listening to; and it is my wish to know whether reasoning upon any just premises, either in nature or religion, we can be saved from the false reasonings of so many theories, conflicting with each other, and confounding the minds of those who either cannot, or will not think for themselves.

T.—If you will bear with me I will put you in possession of my modo of reasoning upon this long and much disputed subject; but I must crave a little indulgence as to the time I may occupy in giving you my views fully. I will hear your objections with all attention so soon as I shall have laid my premises and my conclusions before you. And, to secure your attention, I will inform you that I have found a safe haven and a good anchorage, in which I can rest with all security amid all the storms and tempests enthusiastic and superstitious of the times in which we live.

A.—You have my attention secured, and I will promise you either my objections, or my approbation, when I shall have heard you to the close.

T.—We have two sorts of power, physical and moral.* By the former we operate upon matter—by the latter upon mind. To put matter in motion we use physical power, whether we call it animal or scientific power; to put minds in motion we use arguments or motives addressed to the reason and nature of man. The dominion we have over animals is acquired by our intellectual and physical powers, addressed to their instincts, appetites, propensities, or feelings: thus we control creatures greatly superior to us in animal strength. All the powers, however, which we possess are in our spirits, and these are within us. At their volitions we put forth our physical and moral strength. If D wills to captivate B, he reasons

*I would have preferred the word SPIRITUAL had it not been appropriated. The word MORAL with many is also appropriated to denote what is accordant to moral law, good, just, &c. But it is less liable to be misapplied than the word SPIRITUAL, because it is not so much prostituted by system. With us in this acceptation it means what has respect to the mind—understanding, will, or affections of men. If the word "spiritual" denoted only what is simply MENTAL, which is its proper and literal import, we should have given it the preference.

within himself as to the means which he shall employ. If he wills to take him by force, he puts forth his physical strength: but if he wills to take him by argument, he *speaks*. He addresses arguments, allurements, or motives, to move his mind to act in unison with his design.

Motives are arguments; and the strength of an argument is its power to move. Arguments are said to be strong or weak, according to their power to move. And he is said to be a man of strong mind who is able to produce strong arguments and can move men to act in accordance with his volitions. A man of weak arguments is a weak man, though his physical strength may be of the highest order. But the strength of an argument is its *meaning*; not the length or number of its words, nor the noise with which it is expressed. It can operate only so far as it is understood.

Because arguments are addressed to the understanding, will, and affections of men, they are called moral, inasmuch as their tendency is to form or change the habits, manners, or actions of men. Every spirit puts forth its moral power in words; that is, all the power it has over the views, habits, manners, or actions of men, is in the meaning and arrangement of its ideas expressed in words; or in significant signs addressed to the eye or the ear. All the moral power of Cicero and Demosthenes was in their orations when spoken, and in the circumstances which gave them meaning; and whatever power these men have exercised over Greece and Rome since their death, is in their writings.

The tongue of the orator and the pen of the writer, though small instruments, and of little physical power, are the two most powerful instruments in the world; because they are to the mind as the arms to the body—they are but the instruments of moral power. The strength is in what is spoken or written, not in the instrument by which it is spoken or written. *The argument is the power of the spirit of man, and the only power which one spirit can exert over another is its arguments*. How often do we see a whole congregation roused into certain actions, expressions of joy or sorrow, by the spirit of one man. Yet no person supposes that his spirit has literally deserted his body and entered into every man and woman in the house, although it is often said he has filled them with his spirit. But how does that spirit, located in the head of yonder little man, fill all the thousands around him with joy or sadness, with fear and trembling, with zeal or indignation, as the case may be? How has it displayed such power over so many minds? *By words uttered by the tongue; by ideas communicated to the minds of the hearers.* In this way only can moral power be displayed.

From such premises we may say that all the moral power which can be exerted on human beings, is, and must of necessity be, in the arguments addressed to them. No other power than moral power can operate on minds; and this power must always be clothed in words, addressed to the eye or ear. Thus we reason when revelation is altogether out of view. And when we think of the power of the

Spirit of God exerted upon minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that that power can consist in any thing else but words or arguments. Thus in the nature of things we are prepared to expect verbal communications from the Spirit of God, if that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits. As the moral power of every man is in his arguments, so is the moral power of the Spirit of God in his arguments. Thus man still retains an image of his Creator: and from such analogy Paul reasons when he says, "For the things of a man knows no man, save the spirit of a man which is in him; even so the things of God knows no man save the Spirit of God." And the analogy stops not here; for as he is said to resist another whose arguments he withstands, so they are said always to resist the Holy Spirit, who always resist, or refuse to yield to his arguments.

Whenever a person has expressed all the arguments he has to offer to carry one point, he has spent all his moral strength, whether he carries that point or not. But until all his arguments are stated, heard, and understood, his moral power is not fully developed. We add, "*heard and understood*," because although an argument may be irresistible to him that hears and understands it, it is perfectly impotent to him who understands it not. Hence the person in the Saviour's parable on the success of proclaiming the word, who heard to his salvation, is distinguished as one who *understood* what he heard; and he on whom the same arguments had no effect is designated as one that *understood not*. Matth. xiii. 19—23.

A person once observed that he was convinced by a certain argument which all but himself acknowledged was the weakest of the seven adduced on the occasion. But in conversation with the same gentleman, it was discovered that it was the only argument of the seven which he fully understood. It is said by Grecian critics of the highest reputation that Demosthenes owed more of his fame to the perspicuity and easy intelligibility of his orations, than to any other character of the orator which he possessed. It was the perfect adaptation of his arguments to the capacity and taste of his audience and the accommodating himself to the genius of the age, which gave to him the highest niche in the temple of fame.

But to return. *As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas; so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas.* Miracles cannot convert. They can only obtain a favorable hearing of the converting arguments. If they fail to obtain a favorable hearing, the arguments which they prove are impotent as an unknown tongue. If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments; or, if the New and Old Testament contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purity them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent; and he that is not sanctified and saved by these cannot be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine.

A.—Here let me interrupt you. Do you allege that the Holy Spirit can exert no greater influence upon the human mind, than is found in the arguments which are written in the New Testament, or which it used to convince the world of sin, righteousness and judgment after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus?

T.—I do, provided always, that the arguments are understood.—And let me add, that the full apprehension of these arguments requires an accurate knowledge of the precedent revelations. As Jesus said concerning the writings of Moses and the Prophets; in attestation of his Messiahship, so we say in reference to the arguments of the Holy Spirit, in advocating the cause of the Saviour. If men hear not, feel not, obey not these, they would not be persuaded by any messenger from Heaven, or Hades: Nay more, they could not by any power be converted to God. We plead *that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine Record.*

A.—Now I understand you; you do not mean that more miracles might not be adduced, or that more prophecies could not be uttered; but you argue that these only secure the attention, open, or prepare the heart for the reception of the converting word; but that the captivating, illuminating, purifying, saving power is purely moral; and is therefore, all contained in the arguments first spoken, and then written by the inspired witnesses.

T—That is just my meaning. "The word is *able* to make men wise to salvation;" "*Able* to build men up and to give them an inheritance among the sanctified"—"the implanted word is *able* to save men's soul's." These and similar expressions, sustain all that we have said. But we are not arguing this matter from the scriptures, but the acknowledged principles and reasonings of men, to shew that on their own reasonings, the truths which they oppose, can be rationally and fully established. But when we have reasoned this question to rest in our own mind, we only come by another road to the resting place we found in the Holy Spirit's teaching before we began to reason with men on their own principles.

A.—I am almost, but not *altogether* convinced that these things are so; but yet it appears to me a strange assertion, an irreconcileable position, *that no new light can be communicated to the mind, no new arguments offered to convert men to God.*

T.—Men have long talked of new light—I am not an advocate for new light—I believe Jesus is the light of the world. But let me ask what do you mean by *light?* Do you mean a new sun, moon, stars, lamp, candle, &c. or do you mean intellectual or moral light?—You need not answer me, for I know you mean *moral*, not *natural* light. Well, then, this light, like moral power, is all contained in *words.* Where there are no words, there is no light. If then the spirit of God can communcate new light to any mind, it must be by new words or new verbal communications. Words too, recollect, must be spoken, uttered, or written. If then new words are written by the spirit, new ideas must be communicated, and that constitutes a new revelation. Then the sects who contend for special moral influences,

are the only "NEW LIGHTS" properly so called. But, mark you, if the spirit communicates not new ideas, it can communicate no new light. And if it do, then, it only proves that the revelation we have is an imperfect revelation; and that the Spirit of God, like other orators, does not, or cannot express itself so intelligibly at one time, as at another; and that its second effort is better than its first, and its third better than its second. Are you prepared for this?

A.—I am not. And is this the consequence, the logical and necessary consequence to which the doctrine of special influences tends!! If so I must re-examine my premises.

T.—Aye, and your conclusions too, if you please: for I have neither found a scripturian nor a logician in all the pleaders for new lightism.

A.—I will re-examine, for I cannot yet give up; I must rally again. But pardon me for interrupting you: I had resolved to hear you to the end before I replied, or objected.

T.—Other engagements call me hence, and I think it better for us to appoint another evening, and to talk the matter over again. Please rally all your forces against this night fortnight, when I will have more leisure. I shall gladly hear all your reasonings and objections: for I am assured that I have found the ark of safety and the resting place in this long and verbose controversy about spiritual operations. This advantage you will at once perceive results from my conclusions. It secures the undivided attention of all who thus view the matter to the oracles of the spirit, and it exalts the perfection of the sacred records as the wisdom and power of God to salvation to all who believe and obey them. And let me add, never did I see a man or woman, a constant and honest reader of the Apostles' testimony, who lacked light; or who complained of the want of power in the written communications to transform their minds into the image of the truth as it is in Jesus.—They are most clamorous for help, who will not help themselves, by submitting their minds to the impression of the Holy Spirit in its word. But of this more at our next interview.

A.—Of the truth of this last remark, I have much evidence: but I have learned to be cautious, and not to receive any great position because it has many things to sustain it both from reason and experience. But this much I must add; if in your reasonings, there be not falsehoods or mistakes, this appears a safe and easy way of settling the long controversy. But I am not fully convinced. I will rally again. Good night. EDITOR.

From the Christian Messenger.

ARCHIPPUS ON THE REMISSION OF SIN.—*No. II.*

While I claim to myself the right to controvert all that I deem erroneous in the religious sentiments of others, I concede to them the same right, to controvert any that I may entertain. And while this is assumed and yielded as a mutual right, I desire it to be distinctly understood, that, on my part, the exercise of it, does not proceed from an unfriendly disposition towards those whose opinions and views are opposed. I do not believe that the word of God authorizes, in any degree, the belief that the sins of the Gentiles are, or ever

have been remitted in water, or in the action of baptism. Feeling confident of the truth of this sentiment, and the error of the opposite one, I feel it to be a duty to adduce proof of the truth of the one, and of the fallacy of the other.

I would define remission of sins, as others have done, to consist in forgiveness, or pardon; that is, the giving up of the punishment due to them. Justification is of the same meaning in the Gospel, and consists in remission of sins, and absolution from guilt and punishment; or an act of free grace, by which God pardons the sinner, and accepts him as righteous in the account of the atonement of Christ. Meritorious justification is predicable only of sinless beings, while gratuitous justification is that alone which is suited to the state of sinners; it is an acquittal from condemnation by free forgiveness, and an acceptance of him into a state of favor. The instrument of gospel justification is faith alone. Thus God is said to justify the ungodly by faith—his faith is counted to him for righteousness, Rom. iv. 5; and being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into the grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. Rom. v. 1, 2. The meritorious ground or cause of the remission of sin, made so by the grace of God, is the blood of Christ: "this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins" Mat. xxvi. 28. All having sinned, "the righteousness of God is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe—we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, Rom. iii. 22–25. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself: in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace. Eph. i. 3—v. 7. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, Col. i. 14. If there be a single principle in the doctrines of grace, among those taught by the Apostles, which can be considered fundamental, it must certainly be that of the remission of sin through the death of Jesus Christ—upon this subject there is no difference of opinion between the Baptist Reformers and myself. The only question between them and myself is this: Is the efficacy of the blood of Christ, in the remission of the sins of believing Gentiles, by divine appointment, suspended upon their being baptized or immersed in water? They take the affirmative side of the question, and I the negative. Peter must determine this question under the infallible direction of the Holy Spirit.

To Peter was given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to open the gospel and to pronounce the order of the Kingdom to the Gentiles. He had, moreover, the qualifications bestowed upon him by the King and the Judge of the living and the dead, so infallibly to bind and loose on earth, as to oblige him to ratify his declarations and decisions in heaven. Let us turn then to the tenth chapter of the acts of the Apostles, and other passages, to learn the truth on this subject. I pass by at this time the account of the conversion and Baptism of the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and of Saul of Tarsus, on account of the circumstances by which they were distinguished from the Gentiles. They shall be attended to in my next number.

After the great preparation had been made by the revelations of the spirit, and the supernatural appearance to Peter, and the communications and instructions of the Angel to Cornelius which were sent to Peter, Peter set out to visit the town of Cornelius, at Cesarea, who was an officer, a centurion of the band called the Italian band. As he approached it, Cornelius met him and told him that he had sent for him; "Now," said he, "we are all here before God (Cornelius, his kinsmen and near friends) to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." Then Peter opened his mouth and said, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." The word

which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:) that word I say ye know which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: him God raised up from the dead the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the Judge of the quick and the dead. To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

"While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify or glorify God. Then answered Peter, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days." Acts x. 34—48.

Now I ask, were these Gentiles *in their sins* when they received the Holy Ghost, spake with new tongues and glorified God, both of which were done before they were baptized? Or, were their sins not remitted through faith? and were they not received into the divine favor the moment they believed what Peter said concerning Jesus Christ? and were not the gifts of the Holy Ghost a seal and confirmation of these facts, both of which occurred before they were baptized? After that they believed, (before they were baptized) they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which was the earnest of their inheritance. Eph. i. 13, 14. Being the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts crying Abba Father. They were then baptized into Christ, and put him on. Gal. iii. 26, 27, ch. iv, 6. We will let Peter explain this matter. In Acts xi. we are informed that when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision, contended with him for going in to the Gentiles and eating with them. But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it in order unto them. Peter told them that the angel directed Cornelius to send for him, (Peter) who shall tell thee (C.) words whereby thou and thy house shall be saved. And, said Peter, when I began to speak, (that is when he had already spoken what was stated in the 10th chap.) the Holy Ghost fell upon them, as it did upon us (the 120, Acts i. 15.) at the beginning. Acts ii. 1—4. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Acts i. 45. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gifts, as he did unto us who believed; what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. Acts xi. 2—18. It deserves notice that although *Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them* that were of the circumcision, so as perfectly to satisfy them that God had granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life, for which they glorified God, he said not one word to them about his having baptized them—nor did he, when telling the Gentiles *all things that were commanded him of God to tell them,* and even the *words whereby they should be saved,* tell them that they were to be baptized for the remission of their sins, or in order to obtain their remission. The reason he did not tell them this, was, that it was not included in the words which God commanded him to tell them, whereby they should be saved. A proof of it is, the Holy Ghost fell

upon them as he did upon Peter, and the rest of the one hundred and twenty disciples who believed at the beginning, by which God testified that he had remitted the sins of the Gentiles, and received them into his favor before they were baptized. There can be no mistake here, because the gift in a miraculous way of the Holy Ghost, or the baptism of the Holy Ghost was given to them, to prove that God had purified their hearts by faith, and given them repentance unto life before they were baptized; and the Apostles, and they of the circumcision who contended with Peter, received this testimony as conclusive in the case. We will turn to the 15th chapter of the Acts, and hear Peter further upon this subject. Here, before the council at Jerusalem, composed of the Apostles, elders and brethren, over which the Holy Ghost presided—a council to be sure, very different from the ecclesiastical councils and associations of this day. Peter rose up and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost; even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, having purified their hearts by faith. I use the new translation. Acts xv. 7–9. That is, having purified the hearts of the Gentiles by faith, he baptized them with, or gave them the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost as his witness or proof of it; and after he had thus purified their hearts, and sealed them with the Holy Spirit of promise, after they believed, which was an earnest of their heavenly inheritance, Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Eph. i. 13, 14.

The baptism or the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, which were bestowed upon these Gentiles, did not give them faith or save them, for they had faith and were justified before they received this gift, and the gift of tongues, &c. was bestowed upon them as God's witness, seal and confirmation, that what Peter had said was true, and that he had through the faith of Jesus Christ, imparted to them by the words of Peter, given to them eternal life.

The quotations that I have made from the Acts of the Apostles, are the only divinely authenticated narrative of the order and plan of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles. All that is said in the Epistles relative to this subject, is by way of allusion, and must be interpreted and explained agreeably to the order of faith, remission of sin and baptism, as stated in their connection and order of succession in the Acts of the Apostles.

We have now seen in what sense Peter and the rest of the Apostles, and the Jewish converts understood God's plan or method in the gospel, by which he pardons or remits the sins of the Gentiles, and purifies their hearts, which I confidently believe justified me, when I said that, baptism as administered to the Gentiles, is wholly misapprehended as to its design and use, when it is regarded as the *action by, or in which their sins are remitted*, and justified me also when I said, "that it is the doctrine of the New Testament, that God justifies the Gentiles by faith alone;" I mean Gentile enemies and sinners. Such cannot be justified in any degree by works, till they are justified by faith without works. Till then they are in a state of guilt and under condemnation, and the wrath of God abideth on them. This was their state and character when Christ died for them, and so their actual deliverance from that state through faith in Christ's blood, is justifying the ungodly. Rom. iv. 5. This is the principle of justification for which Paul argues. But James treats of the justification of *the righteous;* that is, of persons who are not duly justified in Paul's sense, but who in consequence of this are righteous, by doing good and righteous works; for he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. 1 John, iii. 7. They are not forgetful hearers but doers of the work, James i. 25; they practise pure and undefiled religion, v. 27: they are christians—but more of this hereafter. "Ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; Gal. iii. 27—1 John v. 1. The great principle of christian fellowship is faith—by faith we are justified from all things, and hold

fellowship with the Father and the Son, and with the Apostles; and by it christians hold fellowship with one another. If I have ever known *feelingly* and *experimentally* the pardoning grace and love of God, it was several years before I was immersed, and it was during the period that I had no thought of being immersed; being justified by faith, I had peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding this, I consider it the duty of all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, to be immersed, as soon as they do believe, with the approbation of the heart. I have intentionally omitted saying any thing about the design and use of baptism, in this number; neither have I attended to the baptism of the 3000 on the day of Pentecost, or to Saul of Tarsus. I will take up the subject in my next number, and endeavor to show the reason of the difference between the baptism of the Jews, and of the Gentiles, or the difference in the account of them, so as to reconcile them in reference to their baptism, and maintain the principle that there is one God, who justifies the Jew by faith, and the Gentile through faith.

ARCHIPPUS.

REPLY TO ARCHIPPUS—*No. IV.*

A LETTER received from James Fishback, D. D. of Lexington, Ky. assures us that he is the writer in the "Christian Messenger," signed "Archippus." Having been favored with the missing Nos. of the C. Messenger, by the kindness of its Editor, we lay before our readers the 2d No. already replied to in our April number. Before we can in propriety publish any thing more from the pen of Dr. Fishback, we must review what he has written on this subject. Had he wished to discuss the subject in due form, he would have sent us one argument or essay, and waited our reply; but as he selected the Christian Messenger, and continued his numbers till he had delivered himself fully, (to which course we had no objections,) he cannot expect us to hear or answer any thing from him until we have examined what he has already made public property. When we have finished our review, if he feel disposed farther to discuss the question, the main question, we will hear him through the pages in which he commenced, and thus, if agreeable to brother Stone, all *his* readers will hear the Doctor as well as mine. I must, however, inform my readers that he has complained in the June No. of the Messenger, and in a letter to me, of some injustice done him in representing him as contending for a baptism peculiar to the Gentiles, which we called "Gentile baptism."

Before seeing this complaint in the Messenger, I expected to have seen him either *atone* for the unfairness complained of in our first No. or make an attempt to sustain his references to the history of the Novatians. But as he only *complains* in turn, it is presumed he wishes to balance the charge of injustice by a credit of so much injustice received in return. Thus is my prediction already more than verified. In April last we predicted (page 134) that "before many moons he will surrender either his Jew's baptism or his Gentile baptism in the estimation of all men of sense and intelligence, and among these I include himself." And in June, he not only abandons his Gentile baptism as distinct from the Jew's baptism, but considers it injustice to be represented as contending for a baptism peculiar to

the Gentiles; or, in other words, that baptism means more or less to a Gentile than to a Jew. This more than verifies my conjectures.

But is it possible that we shall have to prove that no injustice has been done him in representing him as pleading that baptism, to a Gentile, meant not exactly what it meant to a Jew! When no less than *fourteen* questions are asked, (see pages 157, 158, of this volume) to indicate the differences between the state of the Jews and Gentiles, with a reference, too, to the proposition—"*That God justifies the* GENTILES *by faith alone;*" and "that baptism has no more to do in procuring remission of sins, than any other work of faith has"—"but," adds he, "you perceive that I *limit* my observations on the subject of baptism to the Gentiles." Yet it is an act of injustice in us to "perceive" this, or that the question of Jew or Gentile has any thing to do in this matter of remission!!!

But I did him injustice in heading the article "Gentile baptism," notwithstanding he limits his observations on the subject of baptism to the Gentiles!! How can this be, when he selects the cases of Gentile baptism, designates them exclusively as the subject of examination, and attempts to prove from these cases that baptism to the Gentiles is not for remission of sins? If he intended to show that we had misunderstood baptism, and misapplied the scriptures on this subject, why not meet us on the whole New Testament premises—why select the Gentiles, and confine himself to them and to the scriptures referring to them!! But I see no necessity to prove a matter which is now before the reader in Nos. 1 & 2, from the pen of Archippus himself. The coming Nos. as far as we have read them, are as full to the point.

The preceding article we have laid before our readers for reasons already assigned. They will recollect that we have already replied to it in the May and June numbers. We stated the contents of it from memory, and see nothing affecting the main question left out or overlooked, and shall not repeat our reply to it. One thing, indeed, was not formally alluded to in our reply, which we discover in the preceding essay is much relied on by brother Fishback: Peter, he avers, did not, "when telling the Gentiles (mark—*the Gentiles*) *all things that were commanded him of God to tell them*, and even *the words by which they should be saved*, tell them that they were to be baptized for the remission of their sins, or in order to obtain their remission."

And, candid reader, will you ask our friend what did Peter tell them to *do* for the remission of their sins? Did he say, "Believe for the remission of your sins"? for remission comes "*by faith alone*," as he has decided!! It is evident, then, that our friend is too sanguine here. He might as well, yes as reasonably argue, that the Gentiles are saved without either *repentance or reformation*; for Peter never once said to the Gentiles repent or reform, in telling them "words by which they were to be saved." This would be every way as scriptural and as reasonable a distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and as good a proof that reformation is not as necessary to Gentiles as it was to the Jews, as is his position and his proofs for Gentile baptism

after remission. Nay, he might as well array Peter and Paul against each other, as Peter against himself in Jerusalem and Cesarea. For Paul says to the Athenians "that God commands all men, every where, to reform;" but Peter gave no such commandment to the Gentiles!

But, replies our worthy friend, faith implies repentance and reformation. Well, grant it—and what then? The *name of the Lord* implies immersion—for it was *through the name* of the Lord that Peter told the Gentiles remission came.

But what did Peter say to these Gentiles? Did he command them to believe, repent, or be baptized for remission? Not directly, Archippus himself will say. Did he mention grace, blood, or the renewal of the Holy Spirit before they received the Holy Spirit? No. I cannot tell what Archippus might not prove from all these facts, if he were to try. But let us hear Peter speak the last sentence preceding the marvellous gifts of the Spirit—

[New version] "To him bear all the prophets witness that every one who believes on him shall receive remission of sins by his name" —[Common version] "To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." The Vulgate, as translated by Father Simon, reads: "All the prophets bare witness of him, that all those who shall believe in him shall receive remission of sins through his name." Here is no command for remission; but the fact is declared, that the prophets affirm that "remission of sins was to come through the name of Jesus to all believers." It is not *en to onomati*, by the authority, but *dia tou onomatos, through* the name. Now if our friend would ask how remission comes *through* the name, he would find that Peter preached remission to the Gentiles as he did to the Jews on Pentecost. Men were by the authority of the Lord immersed *into the name* of the Lord: and if our learned and ingenious friend would ask when remission comes through his name to a believer, unless when it is put upon him and he is immersed into it, he might be constrained to see that Peter does not preach one gospel on Pentecost, and another in Cesarea. And is it not a little remarkable, that our ingenious brother should not have noticed that immediately after the interruption of Peter's discourse was ended, he forthwith *commanded* immersion in water. The name of the Lord, and water, with faith in Jesus, were, it appears, preached to the Gentiles, when Peter told them the words by which they were to be saved!!

His not placing the words in the same order, or using identically the same words he used on Pentecost, is nothing to this question more than his changing of his phrases in the discourse in Solomon's Portico, Acts iii. To these Jews he said, "Be converted that your sins may be blotted out." I wonder why some ingenious brother has not noticed that not a word was said about immersion in Peter's second discourse. One might say from it that Peter only preached faith and baptism to certain classes of sinners: to the more sedate he preached faith for remission; and to the more flagitious, baptism for remission!

EDITOR.

APOSTACY AND REFORM.

"SO he drove out the man," closes the recital of the first apostacy. When man made himself an apostate, God made him an outcast. When man departs from God, he never wishes to return until compelled by pain. Mercy was mingled with the judgment when man was first driven from the presence of the Lord: for nothing but experience could teach him what he had done in breaking communion with the fountain of his own life. When cut off from "the fountain of living waters," his consolations soon dried up. But, alas! the thirst for these waters abates as he recedes from them, and finally he loses all taste for them. Man, indeed, made in the image of God, and fitted for the enjoyment of his friendship and favor, when separated from his presence so far falls beneath himself as to worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator, and seeks for happiness in forgetting God rather than in knowing and adering him.

The reason of this may be found in the fact that the human mind is averse from the subject which gives it the greatest pain. Man wishes to forget the subject which torments him. And having rendered himself worthy of the displeasure and indignation of his Father and his God, he cannot think of him without pain. Hence he strives to forget him. "God is not in all his thoughts" is a saying true, not only of the grossly wicked, but of all the impenitent. Men talk of *a* God unknown, while they are haters of the God revealed. *Man* must have a God: for an Atheist's mind has no rest. But rather than seek or find the knowledge of the only living and true God, he makes for himself a god, to which he ascribes such attributes as suit his own debased nature. This, the *gods* of all mythology prove even to the most undiscerning.

This is the moral death which precedes a man's interment in the grave of his own corruptions. This loss of communion with God, this loss of a taste or disposition for the knowledge of God, is death to the soul of man. Moral corruption follows death moral, as literal corruption follows a literal dissolution. Corruption moral resembles natural corruption in this, that under some circumstances it is more rapid in its progress, and more offensive in its development than under other circumstances. But in all cases when the vital spark is gone, corruption commences its career. So all who are unreconciled to God, all who are dead in trespasses and sins, are consuming in their own corruptions.

To quicken man, to impart new life to him, is only possible to him who created him. This power is now in the word of God; not that word spoke in Eden, nor that spoke on Sinai; but that which was spoken on Calvary and first published in all languages in Jerusalem: a revelation of God not imputing men's trespasses to them, but a revelation of God in Christ reconciling a world to himself, making him who did no sin a sin-offering for men, that they might be made righteous through him.

To effect a return to God has been the object of all his communications to man, through mediators, since the first apostacy. But it is

not necessary to narrate the means employed after the first, second, or third apostacy, to recover man from working out his own ruin. We had better attend to the present economy. Suffice it to observe, that from every economy under which man has hitherto been placed, apostacy has been possible, and man has actually become an apostate. Adam apostatized from the first economy. A new arrangement was then introduced, from which Cain became the first apostate; and so it progressed until all mankind, with a single exception, were involved in one general apostacy, and engulphed in one common ruin.

A new economy was again introduced, and Noah and his sons placed under it. From this the sons of Noah began to apostatize, and in a few generations all mankind were likely to be sunk again in one common apostacy from that institution. Abraham was called out of the general degeneracy, and a new economy in his family was set up. From this, too, the great mass of his progeny apostatized; and God gave them over into the hands of their enemies for seventy years. They were restored: but after a second trial they apostatized so far from God and Moses, that after crucifying their own Messiah, and thus filling up the measure of God's long suffering, the nation, with but comparatively few exceptions, was destroyed or given over to the scourge of all nations.

The christian economy was then set up, full of grace and reality. A new salvation and a new life distinguished this heavenly arrangement. The greatest promises;—remission of sins, adoption into the family of God, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life glorify the New Institution. "*He shall save his people from their sins*," is the name of our JOSHUA by an order from the Eternal Throne.

Man has been treated by his heavenly Father in all respects as a son. Adam the Son of God was placed in full possession of an estate every way becoming his rank in the creation. He became a bankrupt. He was then placed under a pension or annuity of a certain amount, but held nothing in fee simple. This, too, his family squandered; and as they became poorer and more wretched by every new delinquency, God, the Father of the whole degenerate family, gave a new estate, but placed the inheritance in his own Son, and vested man's right of enjoyment in him, so that all his rights, immunities, and honors are *in the Son*, by virtue of an everlasting institution, called, "the sure mercies of David." The life which christianity proposes is *in* the Son of God. He that is united to him has this life; he that is not united to him, has not this life; but the old sentence of death remains upon him.

But an apostacy from this union, as respects individuals, and from the engrafting word, from the whole christian institution, was not only possible, but has actually taken place. Many branches have been broken off from the true vine; for many who have tasted the powers of the new world have fallen away. "Because of unbelief they were broken off," for under this economy men "stand by faith," not by flesh. "Take heed, brethren, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief."

As the branch can bear no fruit of itself unless it abide in the vine, so no person can enjoy the life which is hid in Christ, who is our life, nor bring forth the living fruits of that life, unless he adhere to him. Hence apostacy from him is death to the individual. This is a sin unto death. For him that wilfully and wittingly renounces Jesus as his Lord, there remains no sacrifice for sin, there remains nothing but the fearful expectation of certain and irremediable destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

But there is a declension or an apostacy from the institution of Jesus Christ, where there is an acknowledgment of its divine authority, and no personal renunciation of Jesus. This falling off, this waxing lukewarm, this indifference to the excellency and purity of the christian institution, is intolerable in the estimation of the King: "I will spue thee out of my mouth," is the promise of the Faithful and True Witness, to those who become cold in their attachment and lukewarm in their adherence to his person and cause. "Remember whence you are fallen, and reform, or else I will come to you quickly and will remove your candlestick out of its place unless you reform."

Reformation was proclaimed by the Jewish Prophets to their own people, and arguments offered to move them to reformation. Reformation was proclaimed by John the Harbinger, and arguments offered to enforce the necessity of it. "Reformation unto life" was by the commandment of the Lord announced to all nations; and this reformation had suitable arguments to enforce it. But there is a reformation proclaimed to christians in the midst of their apostacies or departures from the christian institution. The seven letters written by the order of the Lord Jesus to the seven Asiatic congregations are full of this. And the last message to apostate christendom, found in the last communication from the Lord himself, is a command to reform: "Come out of the apostacy, my people, that you participate not in its iniquities, and that you may escape the plagues which shall destroy them that have corrupted the christian institution." Such is its import viewed through the connexion in which it stands.

Concerning apostacies we may learn their nature and consequences from a strict regard to those leading apostacies to which we have alluded. Concerning reformations and returnings to God, we have abundant information in those preached in past ages; indeed, in all reforms proclaimed in both the Testaments. But in these reformations the following characteristics deserve attention:—

First—They are all *personal*. Though the nation of the Jews, as such, apostatized; yet reformation could not be effected by the government without the people, nor by the people without the government, nor by the people but in their individual character. Reformation of manners, of government, or of religion in its integral character, must necessarily be composed of units. When the persons composing a family, a congregation, or a nation, reform; then there is a family, or a congregational or a national reformation. But reformation is always, and must necessarily be, a *personal* thing.

Second—In every reformation there are promises tendered on condition of it. These are motives to obedience; and there are also threatenings presented on condition of disobedience; and these, too, serve as motives to enforce it. Something is always gained by reformation, and something is always lost in consequence of not reforming.

Third—There is only one "*reformation unto life;*" and they who comply with it, obtain remission and life; and those who disdain or reject it, incur eternal separation from God.

Fourth—But there is a reformation of manners which is announced to those who have obeyed the gospel, and which becomes indispensable when they have in any wise fallen off from the purity of the gospel institution. This is the point to which all that precedes is preliminary.

Now it so happens in the very genius of this institution, that none can enjoy it who do not carry out to the full, the reformation which it contemplates and enforces. Hence the partial and limited enjoyments of christianity which are found among those who do not embrace and fully carry out the principles of reformation propounded by the great Reformer and Saviour of men.

It is almost universally acknowledged that christians, as we call them, among us, do not enjoy the same confidence in God, the same clear and unfaltering hope in the Saviour, the same joy unspeakable and full of glory, which characterized the profession of those who first received Jesus into their confidence as the Great Apostle of Jehovah —the Messiah of four thousand year's expectation.

The reason is, they do not so fully and unreservedly give themselves up to be guided by him in every thing. The same causes must produce the same effects, moral as well as natural. Let professors make the same unconditional surrender of themselves to the Lord Jesus which they did who first trusted in him as the Only Begotten of the Father, full of favor and of truth, and their hearts will exult like theirs; their joy will be as complete, because their lives will be as pure.

But the sects cannot enjoy the salvation of God, because in every sect there must be something antichristian; for the fact that there is a single human institution incorporated with the Divine, is that which gives to any community its name, its sectarian designation, when compared with the institution of Jesus Christ. And this, though it be but a unit, is a worm at the root of the christian's enjoyment.

The envies, the jealousies, the hopes and the fears, the likings and the dislikings which grow out of a sectarian peculiarity, like a cancer vexes and torments the whole body in which it is found; and this afflicts every spirit which composes the mystical body of Christ. There must be schisms and all their hateful train where such institutions are enthroned in the minds of the people, were it in conjunction with all the Apostles' doctrine.

A return to the whole institution in principle and practice, in sentiment and behaviour—we say, "*the whole institution,*" without addition or subtraction, and without any new modification, is indispensable

to the restoration of that holy spirit which filled the first saints with righteousness, peace, and joy. We must have the same religion, if we would have the same fruits which adorned and blessed the ancient disciples.

But such a profession would make a new sect, or rather revive the old one. It must be a sect so far as all mankind do not embrace it, or so far as any sect of mankind oppose it. The whole constitution, laws, ordinances, and manners of the kingdom of Jesus Christ revived would make the people who understand, believe, and practise them so far a sect as they are opposed; but no farther. And most certainly none of the sects hitherto existing are built exclusively upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets: for even the ordinances, nay, the constitution, and the naturalization of citizens as respects this kingdom, have not as yet by any sect been so understood as they are now beginning to be understood. In a word, christians could not, in the true sense of language, enjoy the christian religion; for it was not understood, and is not now fully understood by any sect, or by a minority in any sect in christendom. While christians, so called, are warring about their opinions, and erecting exclusive establishments and maintaining the sects and schisms which their fathers made, it is proof positive that they are estranged from the simplicity which is in Christ; that they are in Babylon, and, as they often confess, in a cloudy and dark day, in the wilderness. The whole head is sick and the heart faint, and unless a reformation radical and coextensive with the apostacy is effected, men may profess, but cannot enjoy, the religion of the Saviour of the world.

But the old cry, "The temple of the Lord is with us," we have been blessed, we are his people, "we are the true circumcision," blinds the eyes and hardens the hearts of many against a radical reformation. We are rich, we are full, we are honorable, &c. is the cry which prevents thousands from stooping to inquire what means the command, "I counsel you to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that you may be rich; and white raiment, that you may be clothed; and anoint your eyes with eye-salve, that you may see." Unless a distrust is created, none will examine; and therefore none will reform.

Professors need not accuse us of making a new sect, nor pretend that they can be happy in God without a reformation as radical as that for which we contend. If the revival of the uncorrupted religion of the New Testament, free from any humanisms, make a new sect, then it will only prove that all the sects are more or less gone into the apostacy. And if it did not prove this, it would be an argument against it. But so long as no humanism is advocated by us or made preliminary to admission into the christian kingdom, nor enforced upon them in the kingdom, the cry of a new sect is only a calumny. And that the experience of all professors, when compared with what the New Testament exhibits, is defective, every honest man in those establishments has only to examine himself to find the proof. But it must be remembered that we plead not a reformation of systems, but a *personal reformation of principles and manners*, an entire submission to Jesus as the only Prophet, Priest, and King of divine authority.

And this, too, is the highest ground which can be assumed, and the only ground on which a man intelligent in the scriptures can stand approved before God, the universe, and his own conscience. None that come after us can go farther back than the day of Pentecost; none can plead for more than an unconditional surrender to Jesus and his Apostles in their official designations; none can reasonably ask less. We are confident, then, that we stand upon the only tenable ground in the universe; that we have the approbation of God, angels, and all the dead saints; and that were all the Apostles and Prophets again to revisit the earth, they would take sides with us in this controversy; and if blamed by them it would not be for the ground we have assumed, but for our failure to stand fairly upon it, or for our delinquency in carrying it out in all its details. In case of such a rebuke from them, we would reply, 'Show us our errors; we wish to see them; our hearts are right in the matter, and we wish our efforts to correspond with them. Such confidence have we towards God in the cause we plead.

Our opponents may be sincere and honest; some of them, we doubt not, are so; but none of them have presumed to say that they can have such confidence; nay, they have said so much already of a contrary import that they cannot now say it. None of them say that things are as they ought to be in the schemes which they support. They are afraid of changing for the worse; but all admit the possibility of changing for the better. Not a man will lay his hand upon his heart and say, that before God he thinks that the present order of things is the order of things established by the Apostles. None will say that christians are what they ought to be, or might be, under the uncorrupted institutions of Jesus Christ. They cannot, therefore, unequivocally vindicate their cause nor their course

It is to no purpose to say that they prefer their order of things or their views and traditions to that reformation which we plead, because they do not see it fully developed, they see things only in progress, or perhaps they do not put themselves to the trouble to examine into the real merits of the cause. They must admit the ground we take is unexceptionable—it is *apostolic;* and our failure to exemplify it fully is to be charged to them, in a great measure, who throw obstacles in our way, and endeavor to turn away the ears of the people from the ancient gospel and order of things. But to the Lord, and not to us, they have to account for this.

Let those who plead this cause give them no real occasion to speak reproachfully of it, or of them, and we have the approbation of our King, and shall be pleased with the measure of success which he is pleased to bestow on our efforts, which has hitherto incomparably transcended our most sanguine expectations. This reformation must be effected soon or late; else the promises and the plainest predictions shall have failed for once. But this cannot be. The only question with any can be, Is this the time for it? And let us answer this question as we may, we are sure that it is *our* time and *our* duty to plead for it, because we have been made to know what is, and what is

not, the institution of Jesus. And no man lights a candle to put it under a corn-measure, but on a stand. We are, therefore, divinely called to the work. EDITOR.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

COUNTERFEITS.

Dear Brother:

WHEN we are wrong, it is of great importance that we should know it. Without this knowledge, we can never be redeemed from error; for we cannot be induced to forsake the path we are pursuing, unless we are first persuaded that it is leading us astray. We make but little progress, however, in recovering from error, unless we are enabled to discover also the *cause* of our mistake: and even this will profit us little if we are not made acquainted with the *manner* in which we have been deceived; for until we know the way in which we have strayed, it is impossible for us to find the way by which we should return.

As we have already spoken (p. 123) of the delusion in which the human race has become involved, and have evinced that it has been owing to a departure from the order which God first instituted, permit me now to exhibit the manner in which Satan, who is styled the *Deceiver of the Nations*, has succeeded in accomplishing his purposes.

It is evident, then, that in every age it has been by COUNTERFEITS. Than this we can conceive of no mode more ingenious or efficient. Against an open enemy every one is on his guard; but when he presents himself under the semblance of a friend, the unsuspecting confidence of affection, the most honorable principles, and the warmest feelings of the heart, may be made to forward the design of the betrayer, and to promote the destruction of the unfortunate victim. In what intricate mazes may not that stranger be lost, over what precipices may he not be hurled headlong, who is under the conduct of a false guide! To what unknown regions may not that pilot steer, far from the intended port, and in what yawning abyss may not his vessel be engulphed, who trusts to an illusive compass! At first, indeed, the mariner, pleased with the novelty of his situation, and his bosom swelling with joyful anticipation, may not discover the apparently slight deviation of the needle, while the frail bark glides along the well known shores, and the friendly beacon is still in view; but when the blue mountains are lost in the distance, and sea and sky alone are seen, then it is that, trusting entirely to the guide which he confidently supposes has brought him thus far safely on his voyage, he is lost upon the boundless world of waters, and "drifted to a returnless distance from his family and his home."

Thus, then, I repeat, by the substitution of falsehood for truth, and appearance for reality, men have been, from the very beginning, led into the paths of error and delusion. In the outset, indeed, the course pursued may not have seemed to deviate from the correct one; but no sooner has the deceitful leader obtained the confidence of his

followers, and all the well known landmarks have faded from their memory, than he has boldly led his willing victims to their everlasting ruin.

By the persuasions of the Deceiver our first parents found themselves, in the very commencement of their career, driven from Eden and cut off from the tree of life. But the Tempter, in saying to them, "You shall not surely die," intimated to them that they should continue to enjoy life. Accordingly, we find that after they had sinned they continued to possess that life. Life, did I say!—nay, rather a counterfeit, a dream for a reality, a shadow, an image, a mere resemblance! We speak of our mortal life.—This is a contradiction in terms: Is life indeed mortal? can it die? or is it possible for death to live?—A smoke which appears for a little time, and then vanishes away; a wavering delusive light, that leads us through pains, toils and sorrows—to the grave! Does this indeed deserve the name of Life? Oh! no. The Lord is the fountain of life, and in his favor it can alone be found. When Christ preached to men, "he preached to those who were dead." He is the life—the bread of life. They who hate him love death; they who are separated from him are dead. Though they eat bread, they shall hunger; though they drink water, they shall thirst again; and although they may seem to have life, yet do they possess it only in appearance; for that alone is truly life which is eternal, and they only live who are nourished by the tree of life, and led to the fountains of living water.

> *"They live, they greatly live a life on earth*
> *Unkindled, unconceived, and from an eye*
> *Of tenderness let heavenly pity fall*
> *On us more justly numbered with the dead.*
> *This is the desert! this the solitude!*
> *How populous, how vital is the grave!*
> *This is Creation's melancholy vault,*
> *The vale funereal, the sad cypress gloom;*
> *The land of apparitions, empty shades:*
> *All, all on earth is shadow, all beyond*
> *Is substance. The reverse is Folly's creed."*

Death being thus permitted for a while to prevail, that the excellency of eternal life might be more conspicuous, a new scene is presented to our view. Man having died, or fallen, and his character having been thus degraded, the Divine Creator reveals himself to him, in order that, being now able to judge by contrast, he might be enticed by the glory and excellency of his character to imitate his perfections, and, taught by experience, be induced to relinquish the false and vain enjoyments of a fleeting existence, and exchange the counterfeit for an everlasting life.

Displaying therefore his wisdom, justice and tender mercy, he clothes the naked, foretells a final victory over the Serpent, and gives the gracious promise of a Deliverer. He teaches men to regard him not only as their Creator, but as their Redeemer; and from this period

until the seed of the woman had burst those chains of death into whose power satan had delivered them, he continued to address them from time to time by his patriarchs, his prophets, his judgments, his mercies, and his institutions to keep alive the knowledge of his name, and to give a perfect revelation of his character.

Satan now discovering that mankind could not be brought fully under his dominion, so long as the knowledge of the true God remained with them, endeavors to deprive them of that knowledge, by proposing to them, as objects of worship, *counterfeit gods.*

This was accomplished by degrees. First, by exhibiting some glorious object in creation as an apt emblem of the Creator, and then teaching them to pay religious homage to this object, as a representative of God. Accordingly the Sun, which like its Author diffuses light, life and glory, was, throughout the world, under various names, the first object of idolatrous worship. The Moon came next to receive divine homage, as the second in importance of the heavenly bodies; and after these the planets, as having attracted notice by their appearance and motions. Thus the Greeks worshipped the sun under the title of Saturn, or Apollo, and the moon under that of Diana. The Egyptians, the Philistines, the Zidonians, the Babylonians, the Syrians, and the Ammonites, sacrificed to the same divinities under the appellations of Ammon, Isis, Astarte, Ashtaroth, Bel or Moloch. And seeing that in this as in every other departure from rectitude, "C'est le premier pas qui coute," the first step is the only difficulty, the world soon began to substitute things which bore some real or supposed analogy to their new divinities.

To this idolatrous worship, which was so common among the nations around them, the Jews themselves were exceedingly addicted. On this account, it seems, that both the Tabernacle and the Temple were so placed that the entrance of each was from the *east*, that the Israelites in praying towards them might have their backs towards the rising sun. So Ezekiel viii. 16 17, says: "I was brought into the inner court of the Lord's house, and saw at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, about five and twenty men with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, who worshipped the sun towards the east." Job also alludes to the same practice when he says, (xxxi. 26) "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath been secretly enticed or my mouth hath kissed my hand, this also were an iniquity to be punished by the Judge, for I should have denied the God that is above." We read also that Solomon in his old age "went after Ashtaroth (a name for the moon) the Goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites." 1 Kings, xi. And that he built upon Mount Olivet "a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Moloch the abomination of the children of Ammon." Chemosh signifies *the solar fire.* Moloch was also the name of an idol made to represent the sun, the Saturn of the Carthagenians. We may observe also that in the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal, the answer was

given by *fire;* for Baalim, or the different kinds of Baals, as Baal-Berith, Baal-Peor, Baal-Tamar, Baal-Zebub, &c. were representations of the sun under different forms. The most common one was that of a bull, with a wide gaping mouth to receive the victims, whether animals or children, which were burnt to death by a fire within. This was their usual mode of offering sacrifice; and the Valley of Tophet, or of the Son of Hinnom, between Mount Olivet and Jerusalem, is noted for the many cruel offerings there made in this way. Thus we are told that Manasseh "reared up altars for Baalim, and made groves, (idols?) and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them. And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his children to pass through the fire in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom." 2 Chron. xxxiii. See also Jer. xix.

As the rock just loosened from the mountain's brow gathers force and velocity as it proceeds, and rushes with overwhelming violence into the abyss below, so mankind, thus deprived of the knowledge of the true God, supposing that they saw in the creature the excellencies of the Creator who is blessed forever, and multiplying the objects of their worship according to the dictates of fancy or the desires of ambition, plunged deeper and deeper into ignorance and superstition. They represented Him not under his true character, but under such an one as *they wished him to possess.* Governed by the lowest propensities of human nature, they imagined the invisible God to be altogether such an one as themselves; and deifying the vilest passions, they gave themselves up, soul and body, to work all manner of iniquity with greediness.

Man stands at the head of the creation. All things being placed under his feet, and being constituted monarch of all he surveys, his eye beholds no equal; and among all the things that are made, there is nothing to which he can be compared. Even when he fell from his first estate he retained his superiority: for if man was degraded, so was creation; and he still remained, though fallen, lord of a fallen world. It being as impossible for man, thus lowered, to elevate his character without having before him one superior to his own, as it would be for him to elevate his person in the air without having something higher than himself; and it being shown that he has no equal, much less a superior in creation, it is evident that he must look out of the world altogether for a model, and that God himself, in whose image he was originally created, is the only Being that can furnish it. How great therefore the cunning of the Deceiver in placing before man natural objects as representations of God; objects which, far from being comparable to the Creator, were inferior even to man himself, and which consequently, in place of exalting him, could only more and more degrade him!

It may also be worthy of observation that nations, like individuals, have their peculiar characteristics. And as there is always a correspondence between the character of a people and that of their divinity, we would expect to find the same difference between the ancient

deities as there were between the nations who gave them birth; for as it is more easy to intercept the rays of the sun than to imitate their brightness, as a beautiful statue can with more facility be converted into a rude stone than the unhewn marble can be made to assume the elegant proportions of a Belvidere Apollo, so the nations found it more convenient to suit the character of the Divinity to their own, than to adapt their character to that of the Divinity. Accordingly we find that after they were sunk in idolatry, and had lost all knowledge of the true God, every country was provided with deities suited to the character of the people. We see the Egyptians, for instance, who were a people devoted to agriculture, paying divine honors to Osiris, one of their kings, to whose instructions they considered themselves indebted for their skill in cultivating the soil. And as the ox was an animal of important service in agricultural pursuits, he was soon chosen to be a representative of the person and divinity of Osiris. At the death of their idol, the priests shaved their heads, and Egypt mourned; but no sooner was another ox discovered having the peculiar marks and spots which qualified him to be a god, than, supposing Osiris restored to life, the people celebrated the re-appearance of their deity with the most superstitious ceremonies and extravagant demonstrations of joy. And as they believed Osiris himself to be the representative of the sun, so, esteeming his wife Isis as the moon, they worshipped her also under the emblem of a cow.

The voluptuous Greeks, importing their divinities from Egypt, gave to Osiris the name and character of Bacchus, and worshipped the Deity under the character of a drunkard and a debauchee. Impetuous in their disposition, and wanton in their imagination, while they saw a superior being in every object which caused terror, inspired gratitude, or excited love, they attributed to their innumerable divinities the same passions which afflict the human race, and supposed them to be appeased or provoked just as the imperfect beings to whose superstition they owed their existence.

The more warlike Romans were taught to pay the most abundant honors to the god of war, from whom they even claimed to be descended, and imagined the Deity to be delighted with human slaughter. Seated in his blood-stained car, and drawn by furious steeds, they were accustomed to represent him as presiding over the contest, plunging amidst the tumult of opposing armies, and enjoying all the horrors of the field of battle.

The northern nations were each provided with a divinity adapted to their peculiar genius. Here we perceive the fierce Germans yielding homage to gods as cruel as themselves; and there the Gauls, under the tutelage of the Druids, supposing that their idols could be appeased by human sacrifices. Now we see a people engaged in the worship of Thor; and again we find them proposing to themselves no higher felicity in a future state than to drink the blood of their enemies from their skulls in the halls of Odin.

Thus did Satan, by the introduction of false gods, succeed not only in destroying the knowledge of the true God, but as a necessary con-

sequence, in hurrying mankind into every species of enormity. Here, under the auspices of Bacchus and of Venus, he leads his miserable victims into the unheard of pollutions of the Bacchanalia. There Mars and Bellona thunder along the ranks of armed warriors, and fill every breast with fury and the thirst of blood. Now the mysteries of a Syrian Astarte, or a Persian Tanais, are celebrated by the perpetration of the greatest crimes; and again, deified heroes become the patrons of every species of immorality; so that the world had become so vile aud debased at the christian era, as to authorize an Apostle to say of them that they were "filled with all injustice, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, full of envy, murder, strife, cunning, bad disposition, whisperers, revilers, haters of God, insolent, proud, boasters, inventors of evil pleasures, disobedient to parents, impudent, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."

As, however, things grow smaller the further they are removed from the eye, so it happens also with respect to those objects which are now far removed from us by the lapse of intervening ages; and the present subject, though of all-engrossing importance at the period of which we treat, may now be considered as too remote for particular attention, and as having dwindled into comparative insignificance. We will therefore descend the page of history, and speak of those matters with which we are more immediately concerned, and to the consideration of which, indeed, the above remarks have been, in a great measure, introductory.

Permit me to observe, however, in the first place, that the development of God's character to man has been gradual. The first full blaze of light is too strong for the eye accustomed to darkness, and it would have been impossible for man, ignorant and without experience, to receive any other than a gradual revelation. Each age of the world, therefore, by some means or institution peculiar to itself, presents us successively with more perfect displays of the divine character. Every age of the world also has its peculiar class of *counterfeits*. Thus when God addressed men orally by patriarchs, prophets, priests and messengers, the heathen world were provided with *oracles*. When the Lord could be consulted by Urim and Thummim, the Pythia occupied her tripod, and Dodona and Jupiter Ammon gave answer to the votaries of idolatry. Thus, also, when miracles and supernatural means were employed by the true God, they were opposed by counterfeit or false miracles. Egypt felt through all her coasts the judgments of the Almighty; but we read that Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses. We need not dwell, however, upon these instances; nor is it necessary for me to speak of the temple that was built in Samaria in imitation of that at Jerusalem, and of the worship there set up as a *counterfeit* of the Jewish Institution, but coming at once to that *perfect Institution* which was to supersede every other, we will devote a few moments to those human schemes and impositions by which it has been counterfeited.

ALUMNUS.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

IN glancing over the pages of a pamphlet written by Ralph Cushman, as "an appeal to the christian public against the allegations contained in a pamphlet written by J. L. Wilson, D. D. entitled '*Four Propositions* sustained against the claims of the American Home Missionary Society,'" we were not a little surprised to see such avowals as the following made in vindication of the benefits accruing to Presbyterianism from the operations of said Home Missionary Society. By the instrumentality of this Home Presbyterian Missionary Society, "many thousands of Sabbath School children, and members of Bible classes, have been drawn within the influence of Presbyterian ministers." p. 7. And on the same page, the Society has succeeded in "bringing hundreds and thousands of children into Presbyterian Sabbath Schools and Bible classes." We have here from a teacher of Presbyterianism an avowal which unequivocally justifies our apprehensions, that the Bible classes and Sabbath Schools were intended, and are used, as great proselyting and sectarian schemes, to build up a sect who has always been struggling for the precedency and control of society since its first organization. Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, wrote a pamphlet, it appears, to suppress or annihilate this Home Missionary Society, as prejudicial to the *Presbyterian* church. Mr. Cushman, after exposing "the misrepresentations and unchristian aspersions," as he calls them, of his brother Wilson, urges these as facts to prove that the Home Missionary establishment, so far from being detrimental, is abundantly useful to the *Presbyterian church*.

After castigating his brother Wilson for representing many of his Eastern brethren of New England as preachers of every thing "from Antinomianism to Universalism," he states one of the most prominent characteristics of a Presbyterian, in a way for which I would have been censured by many of his brethren; but doubtless it is a true representation, and no less so when coming from a Presbyterian preacher. "I have," says Mr. Cushman, "always supposed one leading feature of Presbyterianism to be submission to the decisions of the judicatories of the church, or a redress of grievances by constitutional means." A question is then put to the religious public, whether Mr. Cushman and his Missionary friends, or Dr. Wilson, are the better Presbyterians; the former, who "submit to be ruled quietly by the Presbyterians," or the latter, "in refusing to submit to the judicatories of the church."

Dr. Wilson calls "his brother ministers schismatics, and no *true Presbyterians*," who will persist in preaching under the Home Missionary establishment. But Mr. Cushman proves that he is as "*good a Presbyterian*" as the Doctor, because he acts quietly under and according to the decisions and recommendations of the judicatories of the church.

Upon the whole, this pamphlet might be useful to open the eyes of even Presbyterians themselves to the spirits which guide their destinies, and to the objects which animate the hopes of their builders

A time will come, nor far distant is the day, when an overacting of their part will prostrate the ambition of these aspirants after the honors which come from men. Many of their fellow-helpers and contributors are, no doubt, actuated by higher considerations than sectarian aggrandizement, and they suspect not the object of those who are daily preaching to them about "building up the Redeemer's Kingdom." But if such be the Redeemer's Kingdom, the New Testament is a volume of mysteries, hid from all eyes save those who look through the glasses of the Westminster Creed.

EDITOR.

THE END OF GREAT MEN.

HAPPENING to cast my eyes upon a printed page of miniature portraits, I perceived that the four personages who occupied the four most conspicuous places, were *Alexander*, *Hannibal*, *Cesar*, and *Bonaparte*. I had seen the same unnumbered times before, but never did the same sensations arise in my bosom, as my mind hastily glanced over their several histories.

ALEXANDER, after having climbed the dizzy heights of his ambition, and with his temples bound with chaplets dipped in the blood of countless nations, looked down upon a conquered world and wept that there was not another world for him to conquer, set a city on fire, and died in a scene of debauch.

HANNIBAL, after having, to the astonishment and consternation of Rome, passed the Alps; after having put to flight the armies of this Mistress of the World, and stripped three bushels of gold rings from the fingers of her slaughtered knights, and made her very foundation quake—fled from his country, being hated by those who once exultingly united his name to that of their god, and called him *Hanni Baal* —and died at last by poison administered by his own hands, unlamented and unwept, in a foreign land.

CESAR, after having conquered eight hundred cities, and dyed his garments in the blood of one million of his foes—after having pursued to death the only rival he had on earth—was miserably assassinated by those he considered his nearest friends, and in that very place the attainment of which had been his greatest ambition.

BONAPARTE, whose mandate Kings and Popes obeyed—after having filled the earth with the terror of his name—after having deluged Europe with tears and blood, and clothed the world in sackcloth—closed his days in lonely banishment, almost literally exiled from the world, yet where he could sometimes see his country's banner waving over the deep, but which would not or could not bring him aid!

Thus those four men, who, from the peculiar situations of their portraits, seemed to stand as the representatives of all those whom the world calls *great*—those four who each in turn made the earth tremble to its very centre by their simple tread, severally died—one by intoxication, or, as some suppose, by poison mingled in his wine—one a suicide—one murdered by his friends—and one in lonely exile!—"How are the mighty fallen!" [*Compiler.*]

THE HISTORY OF SIN.—*No. VIII.*

IN the present narrative we shall trace the prominent incidents in the history of sin in one land, and that the chosen residence of the elect nation. Preparatory to this, an allusion to the peregrinations of Israel from the Red Sea to the Jordan shall suffice.

Pharaoh, with his whole army, his six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, his horses and horsemen, were engulphed in the Red Sea while pursuing the children of Israel. So perished the pride and strength of Egypt in their rebellion against the God of the whole earth. Pharaoh asks no more—"*Who is the Lord that I should serve him?*" The death of the entire first-born of Egypt could not long subdue his obstinacy or soften his heart. Egypt was judged, and terrible was her catastrophe. This, however, is but the prelude to the woes about to be inflicted on seven nations, the cup of whose iniquities had been filling for more than four hundred years.

After the giving of the law to Israel, their sins began to be avenged. The entrance of the law caused sin to abound, "for by the law was the knowledge of sin." Besides the individuals and the families which were made monuments of the evil of transgressing a law given by angels, there fell on one day *three thousand* persons, for making the golden calf; on another, *fourteen thousand seven hundred*, for murmuring against Moses and Aaron, as God's ministers; and on another, *twenty-four thousand*, on account of idolatry and whoredom with the daughters of Moab:—Also for disbelieving God's promises concerning their obtaining possession of the promised land, of the whole *six hundred thousand* warriors which stood at Mount Sinai, but *two* persons crossed the Jordan; all the rest fell in the wilderness.

But now that Israel have crossed the Jordan, what devastations fall upon the seven nations which inhabited the devoted land! Each of these nations were greater and more numerous than the whole house of Israel. But this avails them nothing. The Lord fights against them. We need not speak particularly of the destruction of Jericho, of Ai, of the five confederate kings against the cities of Gibeon; of the total discomfiture of Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, Hazor; of the inhabitants of the mountains, the Anakims, nor of each and every one of the thirty-one western kings, with their people, which Joshua wholly subdued and extirpated. It is enough to say that about *fourteen millions* of persons perished before Israel sat down in the quiet possession of their promised inheritance. The twelve tribes at this time amounted to about *two millions;* and as each of the seven nations was as numerous as the nation of Israel, and as they were almost wholly extirpated, we cannot suppose that less than *fourteen millions* of men, women and children, were destroyed. The sins of these nations were of the most aggravated character, and had accumulated beyond all human conception; for nations long enslaved to idolatry are debased into every species of crime of which man is capable—"For their wickedness the Lord executed this vengeance upon them."

After the death of Joshua, the Jews, on sundry occasions, intermarried with the idolatrous remnants of the land, and were led by them into their idolatries. This drew down upon them numerous judgments, during a long succession of years Notwithstanding the mighty proofs of God's presence and power in the tribes of Israel, they were decoyed into the acknowledgment of the idols of the land. The Lord sent them out in single tribes, and had taught them that the battle was his; and though he made tens chase thousands, insomuch that Judah alone in Bezek, in a single day, slew ten thousand, and punished their king as he had punished threescore and ten kings, gave Jerusalem into their hands, and routed before them the inhabitants of mountains and vallies, yet they served Baal and Ashtaroth until the Lord gave them over to their enemies, and made them serve Chusanrishathaim eight years; Eglon, the king of Moab, eighteen years; Jabin, king of Canaan, twenty years; Midian seven years, and the Philistines eighteen years. Under these tyrannies they were sorely pressed; but God raised up Judges and delivered them: yet still they revolted again and again. Then he changed their punishments, and at one time *forty-two thousand* of the tribe of Ephraim fell by the sword, and the whole house of Israel served the Philistines forty years. Samson avenged the wrongs of the Philistines for a long time, and finally died by his own hands, in conjunction with a great multitude of them. But their delinquencies, and the visitations which followed them, are so numerous that it is impracticable to go into the minute details. Benjamin and Israel contended against each other. This controversy terminated in the loss of more than forty thousand of the allied tribes, and of the tribe of Benjamin more than twenty-five thousand men who drew the sword.

In the time of Samuel the Prophet, there fell in one engagement with the Philistines more than thirty-three thousand men of war. Under David the King Israel achieved many victories; but they also were sorely chastised. Of the Syrians David in one battle slew all the men of seven hundred chariots, and forty thousand footmen. In Absalom's revolt, in one day there fell of Israel twenty thousand men. But the impiety of David in numbering Israel brought one of the greatest calamities upon his own people which happened during his wholereign; for by the pestilence, in three days *seventy thousand* men died.

The sword wasted the strength of Israel for many years under the kings, as it had under the Judges. Passing from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands, there fell of the Midianites in one battle against Israel one hundred and twenty thousand. Of the Syrians Israel slew in one day a hundred thousand footmen, and twenty-seven thousand of those who fled were killed by the falling of a wall. Pekah slew in one day in Judah one hundred and twenty thousand men. Of the Assyrians encamped against Israel an angel of the Lord in one night slew one hundred and eighty-five thousand. And to finish this outline by another instance, Judah slew in one day *five hundred thousand* men of Israel!! If the loss of Judah bore any pro-

portion, there must on that day have fallen six hundred thousand men of war

Finally, the whole nation went into captivity, and were wasted and reduced to a small remnant in the land of their enemies. The judgments which befel this people from the time they received their law until the time of the Messiah, or rather until the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, transcend all description.

The most signal favors, and the most tremendous visitations, distinguish each chapter of their history. While obedient, they lived upon the fat of the land; God was a wall of fire around them, and the glory in the midst of them. But when they rebelled, "the wrath of the Lord was kindled against his people, insomuch that he abhorred his own inheritance. He gave them into the hand of the heathen, and they that hated them ruled over them. Many times did he deliver them; but they provoked him with their counsel, and were brought low for their iniquity. Nevertheless he regarded their affliction when he heard their cry, and repented according to the multitude of his mercies."

"But Jeshuran waxed fat and kicked. Then he forsook God that made him, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with their idols. They sacrificed to demons, not to God; to gods whom they knew not; to new gods that came newly up, whom their fathers feared not." When the Lord saw it, he abhorred them and said—"A fire is kindled in my anger, and shall burn to the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains; I will heap mischiefs upon them, I will spend my arrows upon them. They shall be consumed with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction. I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. The sword without, and terror within, shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also and the man of grey hairs."

"See now that I, even I am he, and there is no god with me. I kill and I make alive, I wound and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand: for I lift up my hand to heaven and say I live forever. If I whet my glittering sword and my hand take hold on judgment, I will render vengeance to my enemies, and will reward them who hate me: I will make my arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh. Rejoice, O nations with his people, for he will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful to his land and to his people."

Could we add together all who have fallen in battle, all whose lives perished because of their enormities, in the single land of Canaan, before, at the time of, and since Israel possessed it, the channel of Jordan could not contain the blood which that land has drunk up, nor could the inheritance of the whole twelve tribes afford a burial ground for the untimely deaths which their iniquities occasioned. That land has been literally drenched with blood, and manured with human flesh. Were the blessings of Heaven to be withholden from the

places fattened by human slaughter, not only should the mountains of Gilboah, but every hill and valley in Canaan, be without dew, and rain, and fields of offerings. EDITOR.

LETTER TO R. B. SEMPLE—*No. V.*

Dear Sir,

SINCE the publication of your Letter, No. 3, page 103, appeared, various communications for publication have been forwarded me from Virginia and Kentucky, touching its contents; each of which exposes your course in terms which would doubtless excite your indignation still higher, if possible, than my remarks upon your Letter, No. 2. But as I have myself commenced a series of letters to you on those subjects on which they treat, I have laid them aside for the present. Some rather censure my mildness, and some my brevity in exposing the "sophistry," as they call it, of your performances. But I must proceed in the even tenor of my way, and certainly I cannot reply to you in the spirit in which you wrote to me.

When you say, "I have dashed myself against a stone, by which I ought to be ground to powder," I do not think you wish to see that act of vengeance inflicted upon me, for daring to say that a man may proclaim Jesus in the familiar language of the nursery. Nor, perhaps, would you, in your calm and rational moments, when no indignation was upon you, use those words in relation to me at all. I attribute them not to that spirit of which you preach so much to the people; but to the evil genius of the "old man," or of the system of theology under which your conscience has been formed. Nor will I criminate you, my kind sir, for saying that "I do not like to be called upon for proof of my assertions;" although all my readers know that I am most willing, cheerful to excess, in offering proof, even when unasked, for my assertions. Anger not only beclouds the judgment, but while it governs it, obliterates the recollection. Some men in a passion cannot name their own children. I ascribe these, and sundry such expressions, to the weakness of human nature; for here you speak as a *man*, and not as a *christian:* or, to quote Paul in your own sense of him, "The evil which you would not, that you do:" "to will is present with you, but how to perform that which is good, you find not."

There is another apology for you: You have been long accustomed to rule all your brethren about you; and when you spoke, even the aged stood up. To see any one even questioning your opinions, much more opposing them, is to a person, even as mild as yourself, almost insufferable. Your brethren, whom you now persecute like partridges on the mountains, for dissenting from you, are too apt to censure you. If they would think how often they took your sayings upon trust—how often they paid homage to your decisions—they would see less cause of complaints on account of the severity of your menaces and proscriptions. They are not all so acquiescive as your brother *Paulinus*—they are not all so nervous as to be threatened into silence or submission. When he, in all honesty and candor, publish-

ed, not as "a new speculation," but as a well-established sentiment, (page 28, vol. 4, C. Baptist,) long entertained by him, a perfect agreement with me in my views of the Old Testament; in a word, to quote his own sayings, "that the old dispensation has passed away, and with it, all institutions, ordinances, and obligations, not re-sanctioned by the New Testament;" I say, when he avowed his full conviction that this "was an instrument the most effectual for sweeping off all that rubbish which has been gathered from the *old ruins* of former establishments, to build withal on christian grounds," you put your *veto* upon him, and are said to have threatened, "that if ever his views expressed in that letter were adopted by the Baptists you would quit the denomination." Because other teachers and brethren have more courage than he, they ought not to forget that they have put into your hands the *ferula* which you apply to them with so much eagerness and good will.

Some of your partizan friends, who plead for your "New Testament spirit, I am informed, go much farther than you in some matters; and say (but I am unwilling to believe that they are in earnest) that if they had their way *they would burn me alive!* I repeat it, they could not persuade me that they mean what they say. But when the *shepherd* talks of "grinding to powder," the *sheep* may talk of "burning alive;" but it is *only talk:* neither of them could find in their hearts to do such things. I doubt not but both you and they would treat me with all courtesy, and, perhaps, even friendship, were I to throw myself upon your hospitality.

Neither do I think you intended to destroy a brother in Essex, whom you have pursued with plot upon plot for three years, because he dissented from you. Once you requested him to become sponsor for 500 dollars for the Columbian College, and wrote to him that "you had confidence in his *obedience*, and knew that he would do more than you demanded." He had before this time contributed as much as he thought expedient; but he not only disobeyed your command, but dissented from your opinions on other matters. For your devoting yourself to the *pecuniary* concerns of that College, and leaving off your former labors in a great degree, had some influence in opening his eyes. Perhaps you contributed more to bringing this brother out of the mists of Babylon than any other person in Virginia. But how often has he been tried for heresy? How often? Not less than *three times* was he been brought before his own church, by your means, as he had reason to believe. And how often have you endeavored to have him cut off from the Baptists? Did not even your brother Broaddus once decide that you owed him "a public apologetic explanation of your conduct?" The persecutions which brother *Henley* has suffered would fill a pamphlet as large as the contemplated *Review of the Extra*, promised some months ago, by our friend Andrew Broaddus. But I feel assured that you meant it all for good, and only wished to compel him into your train, believing that he was a very excellent disciple, and even a good teacher "of the gospel," only in some "metaphysical errors." The meekness which he has evinced amidst all

these trials is some proof of his goodness, and of his putting the most favorable interpretations upon your acts. We do not, my dear sir, think that you are either so wrathful, or so destitute of even christian sympathy, as you would represent yourself in many of your recent acts in opposition to reform. Sorry would I be to apply to you a sentence I not long since saw appositely applied to some who have opposed reformation: "Even the sea-monsters draw out the breast; they give suck to their young ones. The daughter of my people is become *cruel*, like the ostrich in the wilderness."

I had resolved to examine the contents of some of your late communications in this letter: but finding that I have only alluded to some preliminary matters, and that one sheet is already full, I will have to wait the return of another moon. In the mean time, I thought it due to you, myself, and the public, to make some apologies for the apparent falling off from a christian spirit in yourself and friends in prosecuting the controversy. I am willing to ascribe it rather to any other cause, than to a hard, censorious, proud, and persecuting spirit.

Hoping that you may not only love your brethren in deed and in truth, but in *word* also, I remain your faithful friend.

EDITOR.

Essex, Va. June 21, 1831.

TO BISHOP R. B. SEMPLE.

Dear Sir,

IT is believed that I am the brother alluded to in your letter to brother Campbell, in the 5th number of the *Harbinger;* that was your friend and favorite brother before the seeds of discord were sown among us." Now, my dear sir, you know that I am still your friend and brother, and only regret that the seeds of discord were ever sown among us. You also know that it was owing to your imprudent friend in Kentucky, who refused to do me justice, according to your statement.

If ever a man was tried by scoffs, frowns, and persecution of the tongue, to wean me from you and the Baptists, I have experienced it. Nevertheless, I trust you will have the magnanimity to say I have held on my way as though nothing had taken place. It is true when those who were wiser than myself countenanced the unreasonable conduct of the less informed, I have been mortified, and may have expressed myself freely; but there is not the man living the hair of whose head I would hurt, otherwise than by the use of means to convince him of his error.

My dear sir, I have a conscience that must be listened to. I claim the rights of a freeman. I claim the rights of a christian; and so long as I maintain the character of a christian, I shall consider it illiberal and unjust in any man, or set of men, *to use means to deprive me of my standing in society as a christian and a christian teacher.* I do not blame you for expressing your religious sentiments in a christian spirit; but I do blame any man to fulminate seven decrees with

a view of rendering another obnoxious to society, whose character as a christian stands as fair as yours or any other man's, for no other reason than that of a *difference of opinion!* Every reformer believes *more* in the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men, according to apostolic order, than their opponents. The difference is not in the influence of the Spirit but *when* and *how* it operates. This is the whole cause of the continuance of the discord. We contend for the literal meaning of the *New Testament*—you contend for *your views* of the New Testament.

All I ask at your hands, or the hands of any man, is my rights as a servant of Jesus Christ. *As a christian I have rights*, and those rights I will never surrender to any man or set of men under heaven. When you grant that *my rights as a christian are as sacred as yours*, or any set of men; and that I have an equal right to proclaim my sentiments among the worshippers of God as you or any man, without molestation; then the cause of discord will cease, but not until then. I am willing to leave it to the hearers to decide who proclaims the gospel. Are you willing to do so? If so, all cause of discord is at an end; and let us appear in our true character as disciples of the Messiah.

Yours in hope of a glorious immortality,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

[In a postscript to the above, brother *Henley*, among other items of good news, states the following: "We are progressing rapidly. Within four weeks we have immersed fifty-four persons for the remission of their sins. Our opponents cannot but admire the independence of the people."]

THE TIMES—*No. VI.*

THE false impressions made upon the public mind by the misrepresentation of facts, the allegation of false facts, and the colorings given to incidents of a doubtful character, so far transcend any thing we could have once imagined, that our sympathies are awakened to a very high degree for those who are in the keeping of one-sided editors, authors, preachers, and their train. It is painful to see, and painful to show to others the alarming degeneracy of this age from what we once thought to be a common, but now really the very uncommon virtue of telling the truth and nothing but the truth. To support the most marvellous tale, the time was, when he that told it, had only to say, "I read it in a newspaper. Be assured, neighbor, it is true; for it is no hearsay. I saw it in print." To tell an untruth, or to give a false representation, or even to write one, was supposed possible; but to *print* one, to put it deliberately upon metal, to set it in type, to put the ink upon it, and put it to press, seemed so much like deliberate murder of the first degree, that few persons could be supposed to be capable of such an act.

But, perhaps, we estimate the degeneracy to be much greater than it really is, because we are better acquainted with matters and things now than we were in our unsuspicious childhsod and youth. Be this

as it may, one thing is certain, that a fair unvarnished representation of things, not only in our political, but in our religious periodicals, is more frequently to be wished for, or imagined, than to be seen. This we learn from an increasing acquaintance with many of the things—histories, narratives, or incidents, which are passing before the public in various versions and forms; from the frequent detection of falsehood and misrepresentation where our charities would not permit us to entertain a suspicion, and more especially from our own personal knowledge of facts as they are, and as they are represented to be afterwards by those who narrate them according to their passions, prejudices, likings, dislikings, or interest. It seems, indeed, very hard to simply narrate the truth without any of the colorings which our passions or prejudices so voluntarily furnish without even a solicitation from Satan.

Zealots never can tell the truth, if they were even to try; because, as water passing through a new channel, instantly is impregnated with some foreign qualities; so the truth, passing through their heated souls, changes its color. But if it were only a change of *color* it would not be quite so provoking as to have a change of figure, form, and magnitude. These metamorphoses are not only of the poetic, but of the historic kind. Better to have a hundred *Ovids* singing his metamorphoses, than to have one Tacitus writing for posterity an historic metamorphosis of his own times.

These remarks, and many more like them, if we had room to offer them, are called for by the following documents, which are only a mere sample of what we could lay before the public. Such garbling, misstating, false coloring, and puffing as the religious prints in opposition to reform are serving up to their readers, must nauseate the moral sense of every man who has only a glimmering knowledge of truth, and a mere bird's eye glance of what is passing behind the curtains in the inner temples of those who are sworn to the schemes which sustain them:— EDITOR.

DANIEL GRIFFING'S RENUNCIATION AGAIN.

Brother Campbell—Inasmuch as we believe the renunciation of Daniel Griffing was intended to discourage the friends of reform, we wish to state a few facts relative to the case to your readers. Daniel Griffing was ordained "a minister of the gospel," some 4 or 5 years since, by John Burch and through his influence, not by the request of any church for him to rule over or take the charge of, nor has he ever since had the charge of any church. When a majority of the brethren at Fellowship renounced human tradition, and contended for the New Testament as the best code of laws for the government of the kingdom of Christ, they suffered all the anathemas and persecutions common in the present day in such cases. Griffing stood rather on neutral ground, and shifted from side to side as occasion offered, until neither party had much confidence in him. He was one of the last to declare himself in favor of reform, and one of the first to turn back when persecuted. He led none into reform with him,

nor did he lead any back to "orthodoxy." We do not state these facts to injure "little Daniel" (as he is called here) in any respect; we only wish to unveil simple facts, that all may see the great loss we have sustained in the renunciation of this 'minister of the gospel.'

J. STAMPS,
JOEL PATE,
ANANIAS PATE.

HINTS OF REV. A. W. CLOPTON TO SILAS SHELBURNE—NOTICED.

He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.—Prov. xviii. 17.

IN No. 7 of the "Columbian Star and Christian Index," of August 14th, 1830, Elder Clopton's examination of Campbellism, No. 4, I find the following sentence: "What in the principles, what in the lives of Courtney, Lunsford, Straughan, Harris, Walker, Weatherford, and Shelburne, bore any resemblance to the late feats of anarchy and schism in South Benson and other churches?" I was naturally led to inquire what the schism in South Benson was. I found that you had presented the following extract from a brief history of said church:—

"At December meeting, 1829, the church assembled, reconsidered and revised this disorganizing vote by an overwhelming majority. Some four or five members, known to be friendly to the church constitution or creed, were specially invited by the no-creed leaders to attend the January meeting. Accordingly three of them, with many other visiting brethren, did attend. The malcontents moved for a reconsideration; which motion the church, after a short discussion, rejected. A strange inconsistency marked the course of the minority: while they would contend and vote with the utmost pertinacity that no creed was necessary, they disclaimed all opposition to the church constitution or terms of general union; and even now, it is believed, the greater part of them adhere to the last mentioned creed. They were greatly excited, and various propositions were made in order to reconcile them; and finally the church agreed to erase from her record any imputation of corruption to the no creed sentiment or its advocates. On their part it was alleged that nothing short of a total erasure from the church book of every thing in regard to the advice of the Association; and that *John Brown* should be permitted to preach such doctrine as he had heretofore preached, or pleased to preach; and that the doors should not be closed against any that they might choose to invite would satisfy them. This proposition the church rejected Whereupon, Elder *Jacob Creath*, Sen. rose, put on his hat, and pronounced the minority absolved. Elder *Jacob Creath*, Jun. then rose and proclaimed that he would renew his appointment to preach in that pulpit on the creed question. Another leader arose and vociferated, 'All you who are in favor of meeting here on Monday to constitute on this book, [holding up the Bible,] say *Ay!*' The ringleader of the malcontents said *Ay*, and forthwith left the house. After which Elder *William Ford*, the Moderator, requested the church and congregation to resume their seats, which was done, and he proceeded to close the business without noticing this most disagreeable schism. On Monday following those who had schismatized assembled in the meeting-house, and "constituted (as they call it) on the Scriptures as they stand."

On reading the above I thought, and still think, that placing my father's name in opposition to this constitution on the Bible as it stands, was placing his name on the wrong side, and giving his influence where he never placed it, and that it may be determined whether my judgment was correct the following certificates are presented:—

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I was present at Meherron, in Lunenburg county, about the date of 1771, when *Jeremiah Walker* introduced the Covenant or

Creed, and *James Shelburne* opposed it and would not consent to it, who was at that time a member of that congregation. Given under my hand this 14th of April, 1831. BRYAN LESTER, Sen.

Now read the testimony of the Deacons of his church:—

I heard James Shelburne state, that when Reedy Creek Church, in the county of Lunenburg, was constituted; and at the time of his ordination a creed or articles of faith were proposed; but he opposed them, and would not submit. I was under his instruction as a preacher for many years, and can, with propriety, certify, that he ever taught the sufficiency of the word of the Lord for faith and practice. Given under my hand this 16th of April, 1831.

LEW. SMITHSON.

I have been for many years a member of Reedy Creek Church, in Lunenburg County, Va. and acted as Clerk before the death of Elder James Shelburne, and do certify there is no creed or articles of faith on our church book; and have good reason to believe there never has been any in the church, as Elder Shelburne was opposed to them, and even taught that the word of the Lord was sufficient for faith and practice. Given under my hand this 30th of April, 1831. JAMES WILSON, *Clk.*

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY, That I have been a member of the Baptist Church, called Reedy Creek, in the county of Lunenburg, Va. during 35 years, part of which time I acted in the office of a deacon, and the remaining part as Assistant Pastor with Elder James Shelburne, Pastor of the said church till his death. I do well know that we never had a creed or articles of faith, but took the word of the Lord as it stands, which Elder Shelburne maintained was sufficient for faith and practice, and was opposed to human creeds. Given under my hand this 20th of April, 1831. JAMES ROBERTSON.

An Extract from Meherrin Church Book.

We, therefore, do hereby testify, That this is a brief summary of our faith and principles, (with some few exceptions not essential to salvation or church communion;) we therefore adopt it as a good human composition in the general, which we agree to observe, both in principle and church government, so long as we shall believe it agreeable to God's word, and no longer, as we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only standard of truth by which the church is to conduct herself, (whatever respect she may have to good human composition.) For we believe the church of Christ will have more and more discoveries of light into the glorious treasure of God's word; while she continues in her militant state; and so, consequently, it would be presumption before God, and forming chains to fetter our consciences with, to bind ourselves with any set of unalterable, unchangeable principles whatever, except what is written and contained in the glorious unchangeable word of God which liveth and abideth forever.

The above is an explanation given of the articles of faith by Meherrin Church, Lunenburg county. A. D. 1772.

RODERICK R. GREGORY, *Clk.*

If the above were not sufficient, I could introduce many more. What is there in these certificates to show that Elder Clopton has placed my father's name on the right side? Mill Harb. No. 9, vol. 2, p. 431. "A voice from Old Virginia testifies that Mr. Clopton has arraigned names of renown as opposed to reform, as friends of creeds, who were just the reverse of what he alleges. The son of one of these ancient worthies alleges that Mr. Clopton puts father Shelburne on the wrong side, and gives his influence where he never placed it." What is there in this extract that will justify the course you have taken?

In your Review of Campbellism, No. 10, Christian Index, of April 2, 1831, you have introduced six certificates, and has one of them testified that my father was a friend to creeds? Not one word on the subject. To show Elder Richards did not intend to convey such an idea, let him now finish his certificate and remarks on the subject:—

"The undersigned being fully persuaded that the above certificate is correct, does further certify, That according to my present impression, the said Elder James Shelburne did not hold with human creeds, but maintained the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for faith and practice.

WM. RICHARDS.

"April 26th, 1831."

It appears that Elder Clopton's object in taking certificates was to make a creed for my father: hence he says, "Where is the likeness between the creed of Elder James Shelburne, as clearly expressed in the certificates, and the Campbellite Creed published in my 5th number?" You no doubt found it much easier to make a creed than to prove he placed his name or influence in favor of one. You introduce sundry names as witnesses, and circumstances to prove me a "Campbellite." According to Elder John B. Smith's testimony, with other witnesses, I was opposed to the Appomattox decrees or resolutions against Campbellism. Yes, I thought the articles published as the tests of Campbellism with resolutions, inconsistent with the word of the Lord or the spirit of the gospel. One article to discriminate this heresy (or Campbellism) is, that "no creed is necessary for the church but the Scriptures as they stand." Is this Campbellism? Was my father a Campbellite in 1771, before Alexander Campbell was born? Do the members of the Appomattox Association believe this heresy? You should regret it standing on your Minutes, and time will prove whether it will be the instrument of discord.

In allusion to the certificate published in the Christian Index of April 2d: The fact is, Elder Richards saw the Mill. Harb. No. 9, vol. 1, after he gave that certificate, and forbade its publication or the use of his name in that matter. You also introduce Mr. Thomas Hamlet to prove I am nearly of the sentiments of Campbell on the subject of baptism. Your witness is not known to me or to the people in this section of country. And should it appear that I am very nearly of the sentiment of Abner W. Clopton on baptism, am I therefore a *Cloptonite*. My sentiments on baptism are not concealed, but publicly proclaimed to hundreds.

As to your extract from my letter to Elder Peter Gayle, there is a misrepresentation. If Alexander Campbell has written a commentary or exposition on the Scriptures, I never saw it. As to your personal reflections and insinuations against me, if you can reconcile them to your conscience, you may: but I will not, I dare not pursue the same course against you: "Michael the Archangel, when contending with the Devil, durst not bring against him a railing accusation; but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Jude i. 9. My Master has set an example; when he was reviled he reviled not again; he has taught the precept, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.

Most sincerely wishing that you may have more of that spirit which was in my Lord and Master, I subscribe myself yours, &c.

SILAS SHELBURNE.

[WE have often had occasion to remark how far the Baptists have degenerated and are degenerating from their fathers. No sect, I think, has farther departed from what it once was, than the Baptist denomination. The difference between them now and their progenitors some one, two, and three centuries ago, is much greater than between them now and the Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The offence has ceased. Even within the memory of the present generation Baptists were denounced and persecuted as "damnable heretics," as "soul destroying and God-dishonoring schismatics," and by those very "*evangelical* sects" for whom Messrs. Semple and Clopton have more affection, and with whom they would incomparably prefer to have

communion than with us, who, "vile as we are," are much more like their own orginal stock than they are themselves. That *they have changed* is most evident from the fact now stated; for those with whom they are now fraternizing have not changed in one essential point since the days of the Long Parliament.

The "evangelical" Baptists, and the "evangelical" Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c. (and there are the "evangelical" of all sorts,) are very nearly allied in their affections for all the same popular hobbies:—theological schools, religious foundations in colleges, with all and every one of the *monied* institutions, whether flowing in the channel of tracts, Sunday schools, temperance, foreign missions, or anxious seats and praying benches, &c. &c. The consciences of the popular Baptists revolt at nothing save this thing of sprinkling infants; and that is a matter of *christian* forbearance with many of them!! These are *signs* of the Millennium too!!

Our brother Shelburne need not have been at so much pains to expose A. W. Clopton in this one instance. Were we to take the veil off all Mr. Clopton's gasconades, flourishes, facts, certificates, witnesses, and proofs, and be at pains to exhibit his own conduct, in reference to his professions, and his labors in the cause of slander, proscription, and exclusion, all would exclaim, Where are the fig-leaves?

I have now lying on my table one document of 18 folio pages, attested by unexceptionable signatures, containing an exhibit of the behaviour of one of his Tennessee vouchers for his orthodoxy, in proscribing and persecuting his brethren, together with other matters and things which would place both the principal and his seconds in a very unenviable attitude before the public: but these are only spots in the Sun, in the estimation of those who move round him, in defence of the traditions of their fathers. I have paid little or no attention to the sayings of A. W. Clopton since he refused to redeem the pledge which he gave. To go into a controversy with him either upon the opinions or characters of men who have preached his views, or opposed ours, is mere trifling and vain jangling. Truth alone is eternal. Soon all the opinions and traditions, merely human, with all the passions, worldly interests, and fleshly proceedings in support of them shall be buried in one common reprobation; and they only who feared God, spoke the truth, and wrought righteousness shall shine in the kingdom of God. It is, we own, sometimes necessary to expose the schemes and the characters which oppose reformation: but when men expose themselves they save others the trouble. Some men's sins are manifest going before to judgment, and they that are otherwise cannot long be hid.

It is principles and not men with which we have to do, and with men only so far as their lives will explain their principles. If any man who deserves attention, whose doctrine and whose life agree, wishes to oppugn any thing we have written, we need not repeat for the thousandth time that we are ready to give him a candid hearing and a critical examination; but to run after them through all their

wanderings and mazes, would be as foolish as fox-hunting in harvest. We are, however, thankful for the above documents, inasmuch as they rescue the reputation of a man eminent in his day for New Testamentism, from the aspersions of one who would rank him among those who are making iron bedsteads for their neighbors, and who virtually teach that men are wiser than God, or more benevolent than he. Father Shelburne and the brethren with him contended for the views which the old Baptists always maintained: and all who dissent from them may be regular Baptists now, but they have apostatized from the distinguishing views and practices of the ancient Baptists.

EDITOR.

MISSIONARY SUCCESS IN INDIA.

DR. J. MARSHMAN, in a letter to Elder J. Maylin, Philadelphia, dated January 27, 1831, informs his friend that there are 20 churches in India, averaging, as he supposes, 22 members each; and some ten little bodies, or, as he calls them, 'handfuls of praying souls;' in all, amounting to, say, 60 more. Thus the aggregate of Baptist converts on the continent of India is about 500 souls. This is the combined result of all the missionary operations on that continent for 30 years: for in 1830 a church of 11 persons was constituted at Serampore, having called Dr. Carey to be their minister. How many of these 500 disciples are Europeans and Americans living in India is not stated; but there is little doubt that a majority of them are either natives of Europe and America or their descendants. For the satisfaction of Americans it would be well that the number of *natives* of India sprang from Pagan ancestors who have become members, were stated in the statistics of the Baptist church in India; then there would be some data before us from which to estimate the actual success of this enterprize in India. We have no hesitation in saying, that if 250 natives in India have, in *thirty years*, with all the sacrifice of treasure and life, been truly converted to God, it is a joyful reward of labor. But how many more might have been converted at home by the same labor, treasure, and lives, in the same time? and how long would missionary exertions, patronized from heaven, as have been the Baptists for thirty years in India? are two questions which deserve the solemn attention of those who are trying to save their antipodes, while their uncles and aunts, brothers and cousins, are perishing at home!

EDITOR.

THE BAPTIST TRACT AND YOUTH'S MAGAZINE.

A CORRESPONDENT of this Tract and Magazine concurs in opinion with Samuel Williams. He says, "no church where I have been has received the sentiments of A. Campbell, which had been blest with the labors of a faithful Pastor who was capable of stating the doctrines which we hold with clearness." How far this gentleman has travelled we are not informed; nor is it necessary to inquire whether he considers Messrs. Semple and Broaddus of Virginia faithful pastors and perspicuous proclaimers. But one thing is certain, he has not travelled far; or, if he have, he has insulted some of those who once stood very high for fidelity, erudition, and talent.

EDITOR.

THE WONDERS OF PHYSICS.

WHAT mere assertion will make any man believe that in one second of time, in one beat of the pendulum of a clock, a ray of light travels over 192,000 miles, and would therefore perform the tour of the world in about the same time that it requires to wink with our eyelids, and in much less than a swift runner occupies in taking a single stride! What mortal man can be made to believe, without demonstration, that the sun is almost a million times larger than the earth; and that, although so remote from us, a cannon ball shot directly towards it, and maintaining its full speed, would be 20 years in reaching it, it yet affects the earth by its attraction in an inappreciable instant of time? Who would not ask for a demonstration, when told that a gnat's wing, in its ordinary flight, beats many hundred times in a second? or that there exists animated and regular organized, beings many thousands of whose bodies laid close together would not extend an inch? But what are these to the astonishing truths which modern optical inquiries have disclosed, which teach us that every point of a medium through which a ray of light passes is affected with a succession of periodical movements, which, regularly recurring at equal intervals, no less than 500 millions of millions of times in a single second, that it is by such movements, communicated to the nerves of our eyes, that we see; nay, more that it is the difference in the frequency of their recurrence which affects us with the sense of the diversity of color; that, for instance, in acquiring the sensation of redness, our eyes are affected four hundred and eighty-two millions of millions of times; of yellowness, five hundred and forty-two millions of millions of times; and of violet, seven hundred and seven millions of millions of times in a second. Do not such things sound more like the ravings of madmen, than the sober conclusions of people in their waking senses? They are, nevertheless, conclusions to which any one may most certainly arrive, who will only be at the trouble of examining the chain of reasoning by which they have been obtained. [*Herschel's Discourse.*]

MORMONISM.

ON a recent tour through the Western Reserve, Ohio, of twenty-two days, in which we travelled, out and in, 350 miles, and delivered eighteen discourses; after which 27 persons were immersed, we learned that the delusion for 1830 had lost its charms; that a good many of those bewitched by the false prophets had begun to recover their reason, and desert the ranks of the new Apostle. The lying spirit, which has always been the spirit of false prophets, had so generally inspired the worshippers of Joseph Smith, that it alone, through the extravagant stories told of miracles, prophecies, and visits of angels, by the witnesses of the golden plates of Nephi, has well nigh inscribed the epitaph upon the tomb of Mormon. Had it not been for the conversion of a Mr. Booth, a Methodist preacher of very considerable standing, many years on the circuit, to the New Bible, the cause had been at this time with the fugitive Smith in pursuit of a city of refuge among the Indians of the remote wilds of the West. But this erudite gentleman, as he said, discovered that there is more than four times as much proof of the book of Mormon than there is for the New Testament: for christians had not one *living* witness to attest

the apostolic writings, whereas the disciples of Joseph Smith had *four living* witnesses to sustain the book of Mormon.

The accession of Mr. Booth and a number of his Methodist friends and relations, some two or three months since, prolonged the existence of this new religion a few weeks. The New York converts who migrated after Smith to Ohio, begin to have their eyes opened to discern both good and evil, and some of them, too, have concluded "to follow Smith no farther." The representations given them of the site of the holy city at Kirtland they have now proved to be as unfounded as the religion of their master, and are therefore trying to improve their misfortunes by securing to themselves what remains in their hands of their little plunder brought from their homes. Smith and his inferior prophets are gone to the West to find the site for the New Jerusalem, carrying with them a little of the stuff contributed by those who have sold their possessions and laid their money at his feet, with which no doubt he will purchase some lands in the name of Smith & Co. and then it will be commanded by the Lord that all who do not help to build and inhabit the new city on said lands, shall be utterly destroyed in the impending vengeance. Before all his adherents are cured of their frenzy it is probable Smith and his prophets will have acquired a better estate than he could have acquired in New York in his former profession of money-digger, juggler, and diviner for stolen goods, &c. &c.

So far gone are some of his adherents that nothing but starvation can cure them. Even Sidney Rigdon told me that "were Joseph to be proved a liar, or say himself that he never found the Book of Mormon as he has reported, still he would believe it, and believe that all who do not believe it shall be damned." But a very few, however, have attained to this faith of assurance; and it is more than probable that none of the late converts ever will.

EDITOR.

Paul's Translation of his own Epistle to the Romans, anticipated by Elder Wm. Brantly.

"WE can scarcely wonder that the Epistle to the Romans should be judged unsuitable for family reading without the aid of exposition; but this arises far less, we must contend, from any intricacy or ambiguity in the Apostle's statements or reasonings, than from the highly elliptical character of his phraseology, and the peculiar use of certain terms, which it is the proper business of a translator to make intelligible and perspicuous by equivalent, rather than literal renderings. Were we, however, to fix upon any one of the books of the New Testament as more incompetently translated than the rest, it would be that very one which, more than any other, demanded a masterly hand,—we mean the Epistle to the Romans. Although the text is happily settled, the meaning of the text remains, in many parts entirely unsettled, being exhibited in that indistinct indefinite form by our translators, that affords the widest latitude of theological dispute, and serves to keep alive an endless logomachy. Were St. Paul to rise from the dead, and to translate his own epistle into English, we have no doubt that his version would produce not a little surprise, if it even escaped condemnation from biblical critics and commentators. In the present state of things, the task of an expositor is a delicate one; for he must be, to a considerable extent, the actual interpreter of the text." *Christian Index, p. 8, vol 5.*

Of course Mr. Brantly knows how Paul would translate his epistle, else he could not have felt himself warranted in condemning the King's version so roundly and so unceremoniously. I wish Bishop Semple would admonish his brother Brantly for weakening the authority of the common version, and for justifying the efforts we have made to put into circulation an improved version. Mr. Brantly has no doubt spoken some truth in the above reprobation of the common version; but he has gone too far; and he must have forgotten how much he has censured us for saying much less against the common version than he has just now said. *Ed. M. H.*

SPENCER CLACK.

A COMMUNICATION from Spencer Clack was received here some time since, intended for publication. Our friend, and, perhaps, I might add, our brother Clack, has had a very full hearing in our pages, even to the satiety of many of our readers. As the last communication is little else than a reiteration of sentiments and views already avowed by our correspondent, we have not as yet found room for its appearance. Our custom is to give to our readers both sides of every subject discussed; but we do not think it conducive to edification to republish, time after time, the same arguments in a new dress, from the same pen, if arguments they were; and still less, to reiterate the declamations or dehortations of those who have been so liberal in this department.

Such communications as the last from our friend Clack, would be of much value as documents for our logical friend Clopton to fill up his numbers for the *Christian* Index. He and Mr Brantly are much pleased with one-sided representations—so much so, that when the preceding documents and certificates from brother Shelburne were forwarded for the Index it seemed good to Mr. Brantly to refuse them an insertion; at least we may say for ourselves, that we have not as yet seen them in the Index. But the cause which these gentlemen plead requires such a policy; and we cannot expect them to exhibit a courage, a candor, and a liberality, which belong to those, and to those only, who know the truth, and are made "free indeed." Any thing *new*, argumentative, or even declamatory, from our friend Clack, will be thankfully received and duly attended to.

EDITOR.

☞DR. JENNINGS has promised us a book, worth 50 cents, containing the *history* of Campbellism, and a *true* account of the long talk we had in Nashville in December last. The Doctor having an excellent *memory* and an intimate acquaintance with Campbellism, is every way accomplished for both works: and cannot fail in finding a market for his performance, as both Baptists and Paidoes will thank him for his homage offering just at this crisis. It is expected by us at Bethany that our friends Broaddus and Jennings will appear in the same moon; and that the two works will make one handsome volume, sufficiently homogeneous as to be bound in the same sheepskin, without any detriment to each other or any danger of a disruption. Regeneration metaphysical will be the rallying point in both, else our skill in astrology is far behind the Egyptian.

EDITOR.

PROGRESS OF REFORM.

SIX disciples in the county of Pendleton, S.C. met for the first time, under the New Testament alone, on the first Lord's day in April last, and had the pleasure of receiving by baptism for the remission of sins, *ten persons*, at their first meeting, among whom was a Methodist preacher. Thus they have obeyed the gospel, and have commenced the christian race. "The crown is yet before."

"Sure I must fight if I would reign;
Increase my courage, Lord."

EDITOR.

FROM the Baptist Chronicle we first heard, but it has since been confirmed in private letters, that on the 29th May brother J. T. Johnston of Georgetown, Ky. had the pleasure of immersing two intelligent professors into the ancient faith, one of whom was Dr. Hatch, Professor of Chemistry in the Georgetown College; "a person," as my correspondent states, "of fine talents, and universally esteemed for his correct deportment and urbanity of manners." On the same day the brethren Creaths addressed a large and attentive audience at the Great Crossings. Even in Athens, idolatrous as it was, Dyonisius and Damaris consorted with Paul.

EDITOR.

FRANKLIN MINUTES.

Statistics of the Franklin Association, from their Minutes for 1830.

IMMERSED, 33; dismissed by letter, 94; excluded, 115; dead, 24. Total, 1728.

These Baptists have declared non-fellowship with "all persons who declaim against creeds." This is more intolerant than the Catholics, Protestants, or Presbyterians: for in none of their constitutions is a person refused communion for declaiming against creeds. But the spirit of religion has departed from them. Eleven preachers in this Association have immersed only three persons per head per annum, and the 1728 members have cut off more than three times as many as they have immersed!! It is now the order of the day to make laws for the case and execute them at one and the same session. The annals of christendom cannot furnish out of the walls of the inquisition such flagrant acts of violence against the rights and liberties of conscience, as the last year exhibits in Kentucky, under the guidance of two or three master spirits.

What was with me inference and prophecy when writing against creeds, is now matter of reality and accomplishment. The iron bedstead is no longer matter of raillery, but of sober reality. He that declaims against creeds, and he that commits theft, adultery, and murder, are only involved in one and the same condemnation.—Nebuchadnezzer has the lions in keeping and the furnace in heating. All who do not bow down to the image at the sound of the bugle, may have a choice of evils—*the lions*, or *the furnace*. Any "innovations on the customs and usages" subjects a person to excision If the people long endure these new task-masters, they are more the slaves of the priesthood, and more deeply imbued with the spirit of slumber, than I had before supposed. EDITOR.

MODERN PENTECOSTS.

IF we could believe the exaggerated reports of "REVIVALS," with which the papers are filled, we would conclude that the Holy Spirit had literally descended as on Pentecost; and that the spiritual gifts of ancient times were restored to men. The following is only a sample from the *Christian Index* of June 25 and July 2:—

"In Westmoreland, New York, there was a wonderful work of God. The sweet whispers of the Spirit seemed to be moving: the ears of many were opened to hear the word; and at length *the Spirit descended like a mighty shower!* More than fifty have spoken and prayed in a single meeting." In Elyria, Ohio, "the Spirit came down while they were speaking; and subdued the rebellious" The reason of this singular outpouring, says J. J. Shepherd, "was a seal of God's approbation of long meetings;" for that was the longest ever held in that vicinity. In Plainville, New York, "the influences of the Spirit have descended like rain upon the mown grass."

☞A JEW, of the family of Aaron, has forwarded a vindication of himself and some of his brethren from some of the concessions of Judah, in the dialogue published in volume 1; and also furnishes his own reasons for rejecting Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. This, or as much of it as we can suppose interesting to our readers, shall appear in our next number.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS

For the Millennial Harbinger.

W Hopper, Hopper's Tan Yard Ky, paid $20 for subscribers. I Richards, Bowler', Va. paid vol. 1 and 2 for A G Plummer, and vol 2 for C T Brown. J Johnson, Woodville, M. vols. 1 and 2. P M Wiles, Ripley, O. vol. 2 for T M'Connell, J Mann, P M Wiles, W Ellis, W F M'Conoughy, J F M'Conoughy, and vol. 1 for J Carr and J Dixon. J Crum, Milton, Ind. vol. 2, for S Boyd, G Shortridge, J Shortridge, E Shortridge, and P Crum; G W Elley, Nicholasville, Ky. vol. 2 for G Holloway, W Shreve, W Steel, and J Allen. W H Purkins, Tappahannock, Va. vol. 2 for W S Croxton, J Smith, T C Gordon, Martha Muse, T Pilcher, P J Derieux, and R S Noel. H Gray, Madison, Ind. vol. 1 for J Vaughter and J Short. J D Barker, Maysville, Ky. vol. 2 for G C Corwine and Adeline Boyd. W C Ralls, Rushville, Ind. vol. 1 and 2 for T Power, and 1 dollar for vol. 2 for himself. W Ficklin, Elizaville, Ky. vol. 2 for H Overley, H Bishop, H Ware, R Allen, and J Williams. R Thompson, Georgetown, Ky. 10 dollars for subscribers, A Littell, New Providence, Ind. vols. 1 and 2 for D Trobridge, and 50 cents for J T Littell. A Chinn, Leesburg, Ky. vol. 2 for J D Thomas, L Coppage, and 1 dollar for J Wasson. W Bruce, Bruceville, Ind. vols. 1 and 2 for S Stephenson. E A Smith, Danville, Ky. vol. 2 for C Fleece. T Jackman, Booneton, Mo. vol. 2 for J Stemmons, T Hart, and 1 dollar for vol. 1 for P Jackman. B Morris, Danbury, Con. vol. 2. J D Barker, Maysville, Ky. vol. 2 for S Worthington. J F M'Rennolds, Yellow Springs, Ohio, vols. 1 and 2, and 1 dollar for vol. 3. C Trevor, Connellsville, Pa. vol. 2 for J Newmyer and himself. T Sweet, Springfield, Ill. vols. 1 and 2 for J G Webb, and 50 cents for vol. 2 for himself. J T Bryan, Owingsville, Ky. vol. 2 for J Burbridge. J Mason, Eastport, Me. vol. 2 for T Parker, T Haycock, E Baker, J Mason, J Fowler, A Henry, and vols. 1 and 2 for J Hinkly. F V Sutton, White Chimneys, Va. vol. 2 for J G Lawrence, J Carder, and T Jones. J W Fort, Denmark, Ten. vol. 2 for J B Fort, R Clanton, and 1 dollar for himself. H Watts, Waverly, Mo. vol. 2, and 1 dollar for vol. 3 for E Martin; also, 1 dollar for himself. T J Latham, Pantego, N. C. vol. 1 for J Clark, and vol. 2 for himself. S Frisbie, Southington, Ohio, vol. 1. G Wyman, Madison, Ohio, vols. 1 and 2. L King, Warren, Ohio, vols. 1, 2, and 3. J Cahoon, Dover, Ohio, vol. 2 for L Porter, E Hill, O Adams, D Hamblin, J Dinsmore, and himself. N L Lindsay, North Middleton, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for J Coborn, and vol. 2 for J Thomas, Mason & Black, and J Clinkingbeard. K Newcomb, Plattsburg, N. Y. vol. 2. Elizabeth Beecher, Lancaster, Ohio, vol. 2. A Chinn, Leesburg, Ky. vol. 1 for J B Findley, vol. 2 for N E Offert, and 2 dollar for J Wasson. W Sanders, Indianapolis, Ind. vol. 2 for D L M'Farland, C Smith, J H Sanders, and himself. J L Davis, Brattonsville, S. C. vol. 2 for B Rowell, J Backstrom, J Westbrook, and vol. 1 for A Westbrook, A Abell, and J Carter; also, vols. 1 and 2 for M Gordon. N Porter, Kingsville, Ohio, vol. 2 for Ann M Kent and himself. S Garrett, Wellsburg, Va. vol. 1 for J Wilson, J Garrett, and himself. S Fisher and J B Terrill, East Fairfield, Ohio, paid vol. 2. J D Wolf, Vernon, O. 1 dollar for vol. 2. A Bishop, Euclid, O. vol. 2. J Rudolf, Garrettsville, O. vol. 2 for R Ferguson. A Pond, Mantua, O vol. 2. D Brown, Freedom, O. vol. 2. G M'Leery, Georgetown, Pa. vol. 1 for A M'Leery and himself. T Hosford, Brookfield, O. vol. 1. M Hawley, Hartford, O 1 dollar for vol. 1. O Clapp, Mentor, O. vol. 1 for C Butler, vol. 2 for J Root, and 1 dollar for W Corwine. T Clapp, Mentor, O. vols. 1 and 2 for J Stibbens, and vol. 2 for B Blish. J Jones, Kirtland, O. vol 2. J Rudolf, Garrettsville, O. vol. 1 for J Young, and vol. 2 for J Rider. W R Converse, Franklin Mills, O. vol 2. H Weston, Palmyra, O. vols. 1 and 2: S Russell, Aurora, O. vol. 2. G H Kent, Bissell's, O. vol. 2. W Smithfield, Deerfield, O vol. 2. J Stuart, Milton, O. vol. 1. J C Caldwell, Palmyra, O. vol. 1. J M'Kelvey, Ravenna, O. vol. 2. H Baldwin, Aurora, O. vols. 1 and 2. W Pangburn, Middlebury,

O. vol. 2 for T Norton. T Clapp, Mentor, O. vols. 1 and 2 for A Wilmott. L Hunt, Huntsburg, O. vol. 2 for E Clark and himself. L Smith, Chardon, G. vol. 2. E W Ranney, Freedom, O. vol. 1. W Hayden, Austintown, O. vol. 2 for J Fuller, C Judd, J G Sawyer, S Russel, J Coit, T Fenton, E Baits, M Bentley, A Drake, H Weston, A Pomroy, and H Reid, and vol. 1 for J Calvin. B Austin, Warren, O. vols. 1 & 2. D Leavitt, Warren, O. vol. 2. D Ewal, Warren, O. vol. 2. A Martin, West Liberty, vol. 2. W Matthews, Bethany, Va. vols. 1 & 2. Z Darnall, Spring Hill, Ind. vols. 1 and 2 for J Gregg, and vol 1 for A M'Coy and G M'Laughlin; also, vol. 2 for S Lowe, and 1 dollar for J Sanders. W P Payne, Flat Rock, Ky. vol. 2 for G Dwelly, H Bonta and himself. M Winans, Jamestown, O. vol. 2 for Blain & Lockhart. W Fleming, Fleming's, Ten. vol. 1, and 1 dollar for vol. 2. G Fossett, Scottsville, Pa. vol. 2. N H Turner, Locust Creek, Va. vol. 2 for N Anthony, R T White, J Winston, T J Anderson, and himself. J G Ellis, Dry Creek, Ky. vol. 2. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ind. vol. 2 for J Goodlander, W Thompson. R Kulb, J Dawbenspeck, and himself. E A Smith, Danville, Ky. vol. 2 for W Marshall, J Mahan, and vols. 1 and 2 for E F Gaines. D Conner, Morristown, O. vol. 2. J Hartford, Steubenville, O. vol. 2. U Higgason, Thompson's Cross Roads, vol. 1 for H Timberlake and A Bowles; also, vol. 2 for R Hollins, Mary Farrar and J Lacy. T Jackman, Booneton, Mo. vol. 1 for S Stemmons, and vols 1 and 2 for P Jackman. P B Pendleton, Bruington, Va. vol. 2 for T Haynes, R Bagby, C Hill, H C Watkins, and W Campbell. J Prewitt, Fayette, Mo. vol. 2 for J Tussey, U Sebree, H Vivion, M Vivion, J A Shirley. J Upjohn, Cincinnati, O. vol. 2. J Colyer, Mount Vernon, Ky. vol. 2 for Postmaster, Crab Orchard, and T Paschal; also, 1 dollar for vol 1 for J Crawford. W Bosworth; Fredonia, N Y. 1 dollar for vol. 2. T S Alderson, Columbia, Ten. vol 2 for G Cathey, T Brooks, M Warfield, J Stone, T Brown and himself. J Stamps, Port Gibson, Ms. vol. 1 for G Humphrey, R Jones, A Hunt, 1 dollar; and vols. 1 and 2 for J Harper; also, vol. 2 for J Stamps, A Pate and J Pate. J T Jones, Cincinnati, O. vol. 2 for Mary Gano, J Brewin, Margaret Dickey, J Forbes, Eliza S Green, D Long, F Spencer, J Challin, vols. 1 and 2 for J Orr, and vol 1 for W Pierson and Mrs Judge Dawson. J Cabel, Steubenville, O. vol. 2. J Gratt, Somerset, Pa. vol. 2 for R Urick and Louisa Robb. A T Morris, Tompkinsville, Ky. vol. 2 for J Wooten, W H Wooten, D Walker, G W M'Whorten and P Emmert. A Ellis, Georgetown, O. vol. 2 for N Sidwell and W Shepherd. J H Sallee, Felicity, O. vol. 2. J Dubois, Fairfield, Ind. vol. 2 for R Snafer. J Jones, Liberty, Ky. vol. 2 for C Huffawes, J Huffawes, J Wilkerson, J Warrence, J Hardwick, J A Dunn, and 1 dollar for A Hayden; also, W Rose, vols. 1 and 2, and vol. 1 for R Stevens. E S Walton, Clarksville, Ten. vol 2 for R Ross and himself, and 1 dollar for vol. 3. S W Hunt, Chilesburg, Ky vol. 2 for A Stewart, R Jones, T Ellis, T Parish and S Coleman. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ind. vol. 2 for A Woodyard, G Grunn, J M Green and J M'Connell. M Ryan, Sharpsburg, Ky. vol. for J Dougherty and vol. 1 for N Lane and himself. G C Gwathney, Louisville, Ky. vols. 1 and 2. J Cockens, Canonsburg, Pa. vol. 2. O Thomas, Roberts' Store, Ky. vol. 2 for W Danelson, J Brite, and 1 dollar for himself. S Ring, Ring's Mills, O. vol. 1 for J Lucas and vol 2 for himself, J Ficklin, Lexington, Ky. vol. 1 for W Brown, T Allen, T Graves, C L M'Gee, S Redd, J Randolph, J M Sutton, R Scott, W Vanpelt, J Stephens, and vol. 2 for J E Christian, J Higbie, E K Osborne, W Poindexter, T Rogers, W Sullivan, J Schooly, S Taylor, J Fishback; also, vols. 1 and 2 for T S Hays, J L Hickman, R Harris, D K Pitman and J Boswell. T B Puller, Enfield, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for T Valentine, J Cooke, C W Talliaffero, D Atkinson, G Sizer, W Redd, J Powell, T W Toler, F Dabney, P W Sweat, Y I Clements, J Lumpkin and himself, and vol. vol. 2 for R Campbell, W Saunders, J C Talliaffero and D Elliott.

☞Receipts crowded out of this number shall appear in the next.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL—PRICE, $2 IN ADVANCE.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 8. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, AUGUST* 1, 1831. { Vol. II. }

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

NO. III.

The difference between the state of the Pentecostal Jews, and of Saul of Tarsus; and of the Gentiles when the Gospel was first preached to them.

IN my last number I showed, by the only divinely authenticated word that we have of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, that God remitted their sins through faith, before they were baptized. This is believed by some not to have been the case with the 3000 Pentecostal Jews, and Saul of Tarsus, from the expressions used by Peter to the former in Acts ch. ii, and by Ananias to Saul, as stated in Acts ch. xxii. I confess that the phraseology used in these cases, authorises this belief, in a great degree; and I have no controversy with those who entertain it; but I am unwilling that the order of the facts, and the phraseology that appeared and were employed at the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, as we have them recorded in the 10th and 11th chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, shall be thrown aside, and those which are recorded in reference to the Jews, be substituted for them. The Jews and the Gentiles were under entirely different circumstances, in many respects, which occasioned the difference that appeared in the facts, and in the style of address when the gospel was preached to them, and they were proselyted to it. The commission under which Peter acted, and the circumstances attending its execution, when he preached to the Gentiles, were as distinct and peculiar as if they had had no connexion whatever with the preaching of the gospel to the Jews on the day of Pentecost. And it is remarkable, that in no instance, in which he speaks of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, does he ever refer to the conversion of the 3000, or any thing that occurred in reference to them, as analogous to any thing that took place in the order, or facts, when the gospel was preached to the Gentiles; but he uniformly refers to those of the Jews, who were converted before the day of Pentecost, who had not participated in the murder of Jesus Christ, and upon whom the Holy Ghost was poured out, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, for facts of similarity. But let us attend to the distinctions that existed between the Jews and Gen-

tiles with some care, that we may see the consistency and propriety of maintaining and understanding the facts and circumstances that occurred, in reference to the Pentecostal Jews and Saul of Tarsus.

We must not forget the fact, that the Jewish nation was incorporated as the church of God, upon the old covenant, under the law of Moses, by which they were distinguished from the whole world besides. The honor and privileges bestowed upon them by Jehovah, as his people, were signified by terms peculiar to them. They were called God's *chosen or elect* people. He was said to have *begotten* them—they were called his *children*, his *sons* and *daughters* which were born unto him; and they were denominated a kingdom of Priests unto God. In none of all these, however, did the Gentiles partake; and they were on that account represented as *strangers*, and *aliens*, and as *no people;* and being idolators, were denominated *enemies*.—The above appellations of honor, and the expressions of peculiar relationship which the Jewish nation sustained to God, were owing, I repeat, to their being incorporated by the old and typical covenant, and under the law of Moses.

The Jews relied upon the extraordinary piety and merits of their ancestors, and the promise of God to bless their posterity, for the pardon of their sins. They moreover relied upon the knowledge and study of the law of Moses—and circumcision and sacrifice for the remission of all their sins. The Gentiles had no plan for the remission of sin. In consequence of the foreseen wickedness of the Jewish nation, Moses and the prophets predicted the most awful calamities, and signal destruction, that would come upon them. The period of their national ruin was styled the great and terrible day of the Lord. Deut. xxviii. 49—64. Joel ii. 28—32. Mala. iv. 1—3, 5; and Jesus Christ forewarned them of it. Mat. xxii. and xxiv. Mark xii. Luke xxi; and Peter alluded to it on the day of Pentecost; Acts ii. 20. As the Gentiles did not participate in their privileges, neither did they in their guilt and danger. The Jews in the most wicked and atrocious manner murdered the Messiah, when Pilate determined to let him go: Pilate declared his innocence, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it—while the Jews imprecated his blood upon them, and on their children; Mat. xxvii. 24, 25.

John the Baptist was sent to the Jews agreeably to prophecy, as the forerunner of the Messiah, who preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin, and proclaimed the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven; and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan, were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Jesus Christ moreover preached to the Jews three years, and wrought miracles, before they crucified him, preparatory to the new covenant or gospel dispensation. By the joint labors of John and of Jesus Christ, a number of Jews believed in Messiah, and associated with him as his disciples; among whom were the Apostles. One hundred and twenty of these disciples composed the congregation or church who were met together in

obedience to the commandment of Jesus Christ, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and upon whom the Holy Ghost was poured out, as Christ had promised—these had not been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.

Let us now turn to the 2d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and read it carefully, and it will be seen that every thing exhibited was restricted to the Jewish nation. Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said unto them, "*Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem.*" He charged upon them the guilt of having "taken and by wicked hands crucified Jesus Christ, a man approved of God among them by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of them, as they their ownselves also knew." "This Jesus," saith he, "hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," which consisted in visible, divided tongues of fire, which sat upon the 120 Galileans, and in their speaking in seventeen or more different languages, the wonderful works of God. Therefore, said he, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ, after quoting the declaration of David, Ps. cx. 5. The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies or foes thy footstool, till I subdue them under thee, and cause them to acknowledge thee their Sovereign and Lord.

Now when they heard these things, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you, and to your children, &c. and with many other words did they testify and exhort, saying save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day were added about three thousand souls.

These were *Jewish sinners*, and were in different circumstances from any company of Gentile sinners that the Apostles ever addressed. They were exposed to the vengeance of the great and terrible day of the Lord, which was to destroy the Jewish state and nation, on account of their unparallelled wickedness, Mat. xxiii. 34—36. To be saved from the guilt and danger, in which they were involved as the murderers of the Son of God, was the leading concern of these 3000. The occasion was a most suitable one, for the display of divine mercy and love, through the death of Christ. The same Jesus, whom they had with wicked hands crucified and slain, is made both Lord and Christ: his blood cleanseth from all sin, and is the meritorious ground of salvation. Peter's reply to the inquiry, What shall we do? was most appropriate. I suppose the following things were comprehended in it: Repent or Reform—change your minds and your

conduct in reference to Jesus Christ, and yourselves—renounce your Judaism, your dependence upon the law of Moses, and upon your circumcision and sacrifices, for the forgiveness of your guilt and acquittal from condemnation. Repent and be baptized every one of you, *in the name of Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sin. John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin, and baptized with that baptism, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Christ Jesus, who *should* come; this Jesus *is come*, and you have crucified him; and he is the only name given under heaven by which you must be saved. Be baptized into his name—*into him* for the remission of sin, that is in reference or in order to the forgiveness or removal of sins; renounce every thing else, and rely upon him alone for every thing, and you shall be saved, and shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost as a proof, and in confirmation of it, for the promise is to you &c. They that gladly received the word were baptized—they put him on—by these means they passed from the old into the new covenant, and having been *born to God* by the old typical covenant, they are *born again* under the new covenant established by the blood of Christ, which was shed for the actual remission of sin; and thus God justified the ungodly by counting their faith for righteousness, and being justified by the blood of Christ, they were saved from wrath through him. I have little or no doubt, but that in this case an immediate miraculous manifestation of the Holy Ghost, was made to the minds and hearts of the 3000 in the act of baptism, and immediately afterwards, as there was to Saul of Tarsus, when he was commanded to be baptized and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord, which confirmed the truth of, and was answerable to Peter's declarations. Saul was not only converted to Christ, but was made an Apostle, and was to be a witness of the things which he had seen. The day of Pentecost was the beginning of the reign of the *exalted King*, and required all the miraculous and supernatural attestations that were made, to manifest, confirm, and establish his character and Kingdom. We have reason, however, to believe, that Saul of Tarsus was sealed with the Spirit before he was baptized, Acts ix. 17, 18.

When Peter preached to the Gentiles the scene was a different one, corresponding with the difference that existed between their state and the state of the Pentecostal Jews. The Gentiles had never been under the authority of the Jewish covenant and laws. They had not been preached to by John the Baptist, or by Jesus Christ; neither had they rejected or crucified the Messiah. They were not exposed to the destruction of the great and terrible day of the Lord, which was in 30 years to destroy the Jewish state and nation, from which the 3000 were saved by their conversion, and from which the 120 had been saved by believing in Christ before his crucifixion, and by placing themselves under his instruction, guidance, and protection. The Gentiles were not *Jewish*, but *Gentile sinners*, and renounced Gentile sins, the sins of ignorance, sensuality, idolatry, &c. When Peter preached to them, he did not charge them with the murder of Jesus

Christ, nor of being exposed to the vengeance of the great and terrible day of the Lord, that was to destroy the Jews; for had Cornelius, his kinsmen, and near friends been living when that day came, and been officers and soldiers in the Roman army, they would have been the instruments to have brought it on. Accordingly when Peter preached to them they were not pricked in the heart or terrified. They believed his testimony concerning Jesus Christ, and the remission of sin through faith in his name, and in receiving Christ they received remission; in proof of which they were baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was God's witness that he had by faith given to them repentance unto life, and purified their hearts. In consequence of these things they were baptized in water, by which they renounced their Gentilism and put on Christ, and thus *in Christ Jesus*, they were *one with the Jews*. These Gentiles were *not in their sins when they were baptized*, and of course their sins were *not remitted in the water*. A distinction existed and must be maintained, between the state of the Pentecostal Jews and the Gentiles, and the events in reference to their order of succession, in their conversion and baptism, were different, and it is a most palpable absurdity to place the Gentiles *now* in the state of the Pentecostal Jews, and address them as they were addressed in all respects. A much less distinction obtained between the 120 disciples, who were converted before the crucifixion of Christ, or who became his disciples, and did not participate in his murder, and the Gentiles, than there was between the 3000 Pentecostal Jews and the Gentiles. The Apostles, as I before remarked when speaking of the Gentiles in Acts x. in no case compares their conversion with the conversion of the 3000, as being or having been in situations at all analogous. But they uniformly when speaking explicitly, compare them with the 120 disciples at the beginning, who were baptized in water before the death of Christ, or the day of Pentecost. Peter considered the Gentiles in Acts x. & xi. after they believed and *before* they were baptized in water, as in the same state of divine favor that he and the rest of the 120 disciples were *after* they were baptized, and long after the day of Pentecost. Acts xv. 10, 46, 47; xi. 15—18; xv. 7—9.

I have mentioned these things to show what views and opinions of baptism are entertained in our day, derived from Acts ii. and xxii which were not entertained by the Apostles, and which have a tendency to deprive, I fear, and if indulged in, will deprive thousands, as it will myself, of much happiness in participating with those we love, in the blessings of the gospel, and in preventing its dissemination. These I say are my fears, and they are my reasons for writing. —Christ is the Saviour of the Jews and of the Gentiles; he saves the Jew by faith, and the Gentile through faith—and by baptism since the miraculous gifts ceased, they receive a symbolical pledge and representation of the remission of their sins, when submitted to by faith, and have the answer of a good conscience towards God—they renounce every thing else and put on Christ; as he is made of God to them wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

I desire to say something more of baptism and of the new covenant, which I will reserve for another number, and after that I shall be glad to see your remarks, bro. Stone, upon my views generally. Afterwards I desire to write a number or two on *the death of Christ*, and *the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, with a view of exhibiting the gospel principles of *Christian fellowship and union*.

ARCHIPPUS.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. V.*

AFTER reading the above essay, no person, I think, can say that I have erred in representing this writer as making a difference between the meaning of baptism to a Jew and to a Gentile. Why, else, all this explanation of the differences subsisting between the state and circumstances of the Jews? Why so often contrast them with the Gentiles, and Peter's address to them with his speech to the Gentiles, if he preach not one baptism for the Jew and another for the Gentile! Immersion, as respects the *action*, is the same whether man, woman, child, table, or cup, be put under water. It is the meaning of the act which characterizes it; and if immersion has one meaning to a Jew, and another meaning to a Gentile, then there are two baptisms instituted by Jesus Christ. This I contend is the legitimate import of the above essay. But the writer does not mean what he says! He explains himself as making no difference between the Jew and the Gentile, as respects the meaning of immersion. We must, then, ascribe to him what some of our good preachers ascribe to the Holy Spirit, viz: "He says one thing and means another."

But Archippus will tell us that he reasons upon the differences between the Jews and the Gentiles, not to show that Peter preached baptism *for remission* to the Jews, and baptism *because of remission* to the Gentiles, but merely to justify *the style* that Peter used to the Jews. For, in truth, according to him it is only a difference in style; and the Jews, owing to their peculiar circumstances, ought to be spoken to in one style, and the Gentiles in another. This is his plea, as I understand him. Well, then, it follows that if the difference in style be merely rhetorical, and not logical; if it be only in the selection of synonymous words, and not of words conveying different ideas, baptism must mean the same thing to Jew and Gentile, and the question will be, whether shall we explain literally the address to the Gentiles by that to the Jews, or that to the Jews by the address to the Gentiles? May we not rather say that Peter spoke the meaning of baptism literally in his first address; and that if ever he spoke of it in any other style, his meaning must be ascertained from his first address, when the introduction of the institution required the greatest plainness? We have, we think, all the principles of interpretation in our favor, and against Archippus: for according to his own exposition the difference is only in style, and reason and universal usage require that we explain every other address by the first, and not the first by the subsequent addresses.

Admitting then, for the sake of argument, that there is a differ-

ence in the style of his address to the Jews from that to the Gentiles, and that baptism means the same thing to Jew and Gentile, only expressed differently, because of differences in their condition, the question will be, whether we shall learn the meaning of baptism from the Pentecostan address, or from some subsequent address? *This is the only question which lies between us, on the hypothesis that he give up his Gentile baptism as not of a different meaning from the Jew's baptism.* I repeat it again, the question now is,—*whether shall we learn the meaning of baptism from the Pentecostan speech, or from any subsequent one addressed either to Jew or Gentile?* I answer, from the Pentecostan, and for the reason already assigned.

It was the *first* time that the christian immersion was ever preached; it was the *first* time that the gospel, as perfectly developed, was ever announced; it was the *first* time that the Apostles spake under the last commission; it was the *first* time that Jesus was proclaimed on earth, after his ascension into heaven, as a "Prince and Saviour to grant reformation and forgiveness of sins;" and it was the *first* time that the Apostles spake under the full influence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore it was the most appropriate time, to open the meaning of the institution. This is in effect the argument used by all intelligent Baptists against those who plead for sprinkling. It is admitted that the first baptism was in a river, that it was literally an immersion, and that no subsequent allusions to the blood of sprinkling can weigh against the clear and fair import of the word or action as first explained. I use their own argument when I say, that we are to expect the full and explicit development of an institution at its first promulgation. If I err, the Baptists have always erred in their reasonings against their Paidobaptist brethren; for this is the strong plea of every Baptist writer, that we must examine the first preaching under the commission to know *who was to be baptized*, and how *the action* was to be performed. When they reason from the Epistles and other remote documents, we tell them we are not to learn the literal import of an institution from mere allusions, or oblique hints, or figurative representations, but from the distinct and primary discourses of the Apostles upon the subject. This is reasonable; for when any new custom or institution is introduced, then, if ever, it must be explained. So it was with circumcision, the passover, and the Jewish feasts. They are only once fully explained, and that is on their institution. So was the Lord's Supper at the time of its institution; and so, I argue, was the christian immersion, commanded in the charge given to the Apostles. On this ground I stand, in answering this question; not because we cannot establish our views from even the first Epistle of Peter, as well as from many other passages in the book, but, were there not another, we must contend that the first time an institution is commanded, it must be most fully and literally explained: for that *has always been God's time*, and right reason says it is the proper time.

But to this reason we might add another, of very considerable weight. This discourse on Pentecost was addressed to "persons out

of *every nation under heaven.*" No person ever did, since or before, address such a congregation as that which Peter addressed on this occasion. "Men of *every nation*" were spoken to; Jews and proselytes indeed they were, but they were born in all nations, and spoke all the tongues of their native countries. Some thirteen or fourteen of the nations are mentioned, not as the whole, but as a specimen of men of every nation under heaven. Now as these persons were all addressed in their own languages, and all taught the same views of immersion, it was of the utmost consequence that, returning back to their homes enriched by the gospel of Jesus, they should carry with them a literal and explicit development of this institution; because, as they understood all the nations whither they resorted, and all the persons with whom they conversed, after their return, must learn the meaning of this institution from them. If Peter told them to be immersed for the remission of their sins, they would tell all nations to be baptized for the remission of their sins; or if Peter told them to be baptized because their sins were pardoned through faith and repentance, then they would tell the same story to all nations under heaven whither they went. Not only, then, because it was the *first* time the Reign of Jesus was announced and christian immersion introduced, but also because it was spoken to the whole world in convention, and from that people to spread every where, it became necessary to speak clearly and unambiguously upon this subject.

Hence we are constrained to understand every other speech on immersion, and every allusion or reference to it, by the Pentecostan address; and if, as our friend Archippus *now* pleads, there are not two baptisms, one for Jews and one for Gentiles, but only a difference in the style or manner of representing it, then it follows that all differences in the form of address, phraseology, or figure, being necessarily to be explained and understood by the first speech, we have only to inquire what is the fair import of the institution as proclaimed on Pentecost. This will settle the whole controversy, unless there be two baptisms, or a baptism which means one thing to Paul and another to Cornelius; and that we have seen is equal to two baptisms.

The question now is, *What is the fair construction, or the literal import of the immersion which Peter preached on Pentecost?* Archippus is too candid, too honest, to dissemble here. He admits that remission of sins is promised through or in immersion to the 3000 of all nations under heaven. "I confess," says he above, "that the phraseology used in these cases (the Pentecostan and that of Saul of Tarsus) authorises this belief:"—to this he adds, without explanation, "*in a good degree,*" "and I have no controversy with those who entertain it." But he will have the words used to the Gentile congregation in Cesarea substituted for those on Pentecost, rather than those on Pentecost substituted for those in Cesarea. His "good degree" is a mere salvo, a special exception in favor of his own peculiarity: for he does not define this "good degree," nor say aught about it. He, in fact, admits that Peter's words on Pentocost teach immersion for the re-

mission of sins, preceded by faith and reformation. This he does, and will admit. In truth his *convictions* of this had almost forced him to a new theory, that there is an immersion for Gentiles whose sins are pardoned, and one for the Jews whose sins were not pardoned. This latter opinion he will not *now* defend; and only attempts to prove that in explaining immersion to Gentiles we should substitute Peter's sermon in Cesarea for that on Pentecost; or, perhaps, that will not suit so well, as there is some ambiguity in the meaning of baptism as proclaimed to the first Gentile audience· but that we should preach *justification or pardon through faith alone*; and dispose of Peter's words as well as we can, as some bold eastern figure, as some rhetorical license, of such latitude as to give play to the imagination of the Arabian, Persian, and Mesopotamian genius when carried from Jerusolem to their own country.

The question "*What shall we do?*" proposed by the penitents in Jerusalem, appears to be no better understood by Archippus than by others who are daily quoting it. The persons who proposed this question, with all their circumstances, must be taken into the account before we understand the answer. They were Jews and devout proselytes. They were all acquainted with the law and the prophets. They were all *now* BELIEVERS in Jesus Christ. THEY HAD FAITH AND REPENTANCE. They only wanted reformation, or to "*reform and be immersed.*" They knew nothing in the law or prophets which reached their case; none of the sacrifices, none of the sources anciently ordained could relieve them: '*What shall we do*, with a reference to this Jesus, this new economy, and to ourselves?" "Reform and be immersed, *every one* of you by the authority of the Lord Jesus, *for the remission of your sins*," was the oracle of God to them. Now my question to Archippus is, *Had all the world been there assembled, and could they all have heard the same discourse, and proposed the same question, would not Peter have given them all the same answer?*

The truth appears to be this; There are more fears entertained touching the bearing of this view of christian immersion upon the sects, and upon the "evangelical" views of *justification by faith alone*, than there is either argument or proof to oppose it. I find no reasoner who has courage to argue the question fairly out, and those who begin to debate it soon lose sight of the proper question, or merge it in some speculation upon grace, faith, regeneration, &c. For our own part we are willing to examine every question, to discuss every topic upon its own merits, and to bow to the authority of the Book. We find no difficulty in understanding the sayings of the Apostles on all those subjects touching grace, faith, repentance, &c. We may, perhaps, yet show that there is nothing more consistent with the teaching of the Apostles concerning justification or righteousness by faith, than immersion for remission of sins.

Indeed, we have yet to meet with the first objection of any real merit against the literal understanding of Peter's command to the inquiring Jews. And as there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, as "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,"

and as the Gentiles were "dead in trespasses and sins," and sold to idolatry, they stood in as much need of forgiveness as the Jews. But in these remarks we have confined ourselves to the main objection which runs through the preceding essay; and as the ground of Archippus' reasoning has been examined, we shall leave these reflections with him until the moon changes again.

EDITOR.

THE APOLOGY OF A. H. COHEN,

(Said to be of the house of Aaron,)

FOR REJECTING JESUS OF NAZARETH AS THE MESSIAH.

THE writer of the following apology belongs to that synagogue in Richmond, Va. of which *Judah* was an elder, whose conversation with me was given in the 12th number, vol. 1, of this work. Priest *Cohen* dissents from some of the answers given by Elder *Judah*, published in that dialogue, and proposes other answers to some questions. As *Judah* now sleeps with his fathers, I cannot but give space to his friend to speak for himself and his people. But the exceptions taken to some parts of the dialogue are so uninteresting and so impertinent to the great question concerning Jesus of Nazareth, we can find room at present only for that part of his communication which respects his reasons for rejecting the Son of Mary as the Son of David and the Messiah of God. All that he advances on that subject shall be laid before our readers; and if he have any better reasons to offer than those now submitted, we shall give him every facility in our power to lay them before the public, and we shall examine them with care. We are debtors to the nation from which our correspondent has descended, and we shall ever treat with all courtesy every son of Abraham according to the flesh, who claims from us any attention, and especially one of the family of Aaron who volunteers his arguments against that Messiah in whom we Gentiles trust, and of whom we boast. EDITOR.

"I WOULD premise that, according to the spirit and tenor of the whole of the prophecies relative to the Messiah, the promise was specially to, and for, the benefit of the Jewish nation; for the express purpose of effecting their temporal and spiritual redemption, by gathering them from all nations and parts of the earth wheresoever dispersed, and removing from them the heart of stone and substituting the heart of flesh, restoring the hearts of the parent to the children, and the children to the parent; which glorious event was to be preceded by the coming and annunciation of Elijah the Prophet. [See Malachi iv. 5, 6.] "Behold I send unto you Elijah the Prophet," &c.

He was not only thus described as to his works, but also his person and lineage as descending from the family, and called by the name of *David*. [See Ezekiel xxxvii. 24.] "And David my servant shall be king over them, and they shall all have one shepherd; they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes and do them,"

&c. nothing of which can possibly apply to the person or work of Jesus: for though Matthew and Luke attempt, by a *varying* genealogy, to trace the descent from David through Joseph, it is evidently inapplicable, as Mary in her conception is said to continue a *virgin, as to Joseph*; whose jealousy, justly excited on the occasion, could only be allayed by a *dream*, ascribing the cause to *divine* influence abstracted from *human* agency: thus destroying, at the outset, this first necessary and essential proof of his mission, and resting the verity of the whole system in a *dream;* in which should Joseph, who does not appear to have been otherwise divinely favored, have chanced to mistake, there rests not a vestige by which his origin can be traced; and if real, proves any thing but the most essential requisite of identity, viz. his descent from David. And here I might rest the weight of argument on this single point, demanding this necessary proof, without which, I am bold to assert, all other testimony must fail.

But waving this advantage, I shall proceed to the second essential point of the coming and annunciation of Elijah: and so all-important was this deemed as a sign, not only by the people, but by Jesus himself, that when questioned on the subject he attempts applying it to John, "as if ye will receive it;" but not being willing, or referring to John, expressly contradicts it by a denial. Thus in Matthew xvii. 10. "And his disciples asked him saying, Why, then, say the scribes that *Elias* (alias *Elijah*) must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly *shall* come and restore all things. But I say unto you, [as if recollecting himself] that Elias is *already* come, and they knew him not," [*Query*—To what purpose, then, was his coming?] "but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Then the disciples understood that he spoke to them of *John* the Baptist."

Without adverting to the discrepancy in the passage, between the future *shall* and is *already* come, let us hear what John says on the subject. [See John i. 21.] "And they asked him, Art thou Elias? and he said, *I am not.* Art thou that Prophet? and he answered, No."

But what is still more difficult to comprehend, and may be admitted as an apology in extenuation of our disbelief, that John, who is said not only to have proclaimed his advent, but witness the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove resting on him, still doubted, as we find in Matthew xi. 3. "John being in prison, sent two of his disciples to inquire of him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Without directly answering the question, he merely says, "Go and show John" *again*, as if a former reference was insufficient, "the blind see, the lame walk," &c. all of which will prove equally unsatisfactory to our incredulity as it did to that of John, unless the former *stumbling block* relative to his identity were removed.

Join to this the instances of his other disciple Paul, who was no stranger to the imputed miracles in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and still continued a persecutor of the saints, requiring a special mission from the clouds, saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" &c. independent of Thomas' requiring *palpable* demonstration for his faith, and our incredulity should not excite sur-

prise when the above stated exceptions are only a few among the many we have to advance.

Another objection we apply with equal force as to the time of his coming, which was to take place in "the latter days," as predicted by Daniel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and all the Prophets who have spoke of his coming; as Is. ii. 1. "It shall come to pass in *the latter days*, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountain, and *all nations* shall flow to it," (and immediately to Moses.) "The King Messiah shall judge among the nations, and rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not war against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." How far this was fulfilled in the mission of Jesus the present and the past state of the world will evince; and as you boldly challenge the mention of one instance in which the evidence of his mission failed, I might, after the above remarks, demand, with greater confidence, of a single instance of confirmation. The kingdom of our Messiah was to produce a reign of peace throughout all creation, both of man and beast; whereas Jesus says, (and so far appears verified in the effects; see Matthew x. 34.) "Think not I come to send peace on earth, but a sword; for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against the mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." See also Luke xii. 51. "Think you I come to send peace on earth? I tell you, nay; but rather division." So in a number of other passages. How this can be reconciled with the *peaceful* kingdom of the Messiah I leave to your superior talents to explain.

I am aware that those variances and seeming contradictions, which staggered even his disciples, who at one time *all* deserted him, have led to the idea of a spiritual kingdom—a second coming; but I invite the information of a single passage in the Old Dispensation or Prophecies which bears the most distant allusion to either. We rest with confidence in the hope that Deity will in due time effect his divine purpose; nor will it be more in the power of the atoms of his creation to defeat in this instance the accomplishment of his work, than in our former deliverance under our great lawgiver Moses, who, though as reluctant to accept, as his people were to receive, his divine mission, yet neither could frustrate the design or arrest the arm of Omnipotence, so signally extended for their redemption; but both were compelled in rapturous astonishment to exclaim, "Who is like unto the Lord amongst *the idols?* Who is like him, excellent in holiness, terrible in praise, doing wonders?" So in like manner, at our future redemption, shall we be compelled to hail with joy, instead of persecuting, deriding, or rejecting, the Divine Missionary of our temporal and spiritual deliverance, which will then serve as a beacon, round which the nations of the earth shall rally and exclaim, 'Come, let us walk in the light of the Lord, the *one* supreme Creator of the Universe, unto whom every knee shall bend, and before whom all flesh shall worship; who on that day shall be *one*, and his name one.'

I could enlarge on this sublime theme, but trust I have already adduced sufficient reasons in apology for continuing stedfast in our faith, which, like the divine source from which it emanates, is immutable and unchanging.

I rely on your sense of candor and justice to afford them publicity through the same channel which occasioned their being offered, preferring this mode to a more indirect course through another press, to which I should only apply in case of disappointment, which I do not anticipate. Pledging myself to afford any other explanation or information on the subject my humble abilities may admit; and should I fail in strength, though I trust not in zeal, there are many amongst the thousands in Israel, of whom I am the least worthy, who would be gratified in supporting the sacred cause and afford you every elucidation on their points of faith.

The next question in order is, "Pray how do you apply the prophecy of Jacob?—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from among his descendants till Shiloh come, and to him shall the gathering of the people be."

The literal translation of this prophecy, according to the Hebrew, is, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah *forever*," [though it may for a time,] "for Shiloh shall come, and unto him shall the nations gather." Now the sceptre had departed from Judah ages before the advent of Jesus, in the person of Zedekiah; nor will it return until the coming of the Shiloh, who is to restore it to the Lion of Judah, in the person of *David* their king, who will cause the nations to gather unto him. Thus literally fulfilling the prediction.

Another interpretation, equally applicable, is substituting the word tribeship for sceptre, &c. which more fully verifies the prediction as comprising the generic name of the nation at this day as derived from Judah. Either interpretation will accord with the prediction.

Your next question applies to what is termed *the thorn of the Jews*, in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, as applied to Jesus; but which will be divested of its point when shown that to whomsoever it may refer it cannot be forced in an application to Jesus; and this has been admitted by many of your commentators. It is generally supposed by our authors, and with strong reasons, as applicable to the nation, notwithstanding your exception to the singular term *he*, as in the Hebrew idiom. The nation is characterized as an individual. Thus in a few chapters previous God speaks of "my son," "my first born Israel," as of the whole nation; and a reference to the context will prove, if it does not thus apply, it cannot be wrested into an allusion to the Messiah either of Christians or Jews. Thus it is said his deaths (plural) shall be with the rich, and his grave with the wicked. The reverse of which took place with Jesus. "He shall see his seed," "prolong his days," &c. Jesus lived in a state of celibacy, and was prematurely cut off by an ignominious death. He was to bear the iniquity of the people, and by his stripes were we to be healed. This cannot apply to Jesus, as so far from being healed by his stripes, our sufferings have been increased—not, as before observed, on account of his

stripes, but our continued transgressions. Thus, so far from admitting that if the account of Jesus by his historians were true, we adduce those very circumstances in support of our argument.

And now, sir, to your most interesting and concluding question: "How do you Jews expect to obtain the remission of your sins, having neither temple, altar, nor priest?" My deceased friend answers, "By prayer;" to which should have been added, contrition, charity, a firm reliance on the mercies of Deity, who prefers the oblation of a contrite heart to the blood of sacrifice, declaring that obedience to the law of God is better than sacrifice. [See Hosea xiv. 2. Jer. vii. 22.] "For I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them, on the day that I brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifice. But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God and you shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well with you." This I trust is sufficient evidence the Deity can and will pardon without *requiring the atonement by blood*; in which we confide with the same hope of salvation that swayed our forefathers for the thousands of years before the advent of Jesus, and which still prevails, and will I trust extend to every branch of the human family, in confirmation of the promise of him who never fails, and has sworn by his holy name that in the seed of *Abraham* all nations of the earth should eventually be blessed; in which soul-cheering hope of love and philanthropy, I rest and remain.

With fraternal feeling, yours,

ABRAHAM H. COHEN.

Richmond, June 8, 1831."

TO MR. COHEN.

Dear Sir,

AS it was said to Saul of Tarsus, so say I to you, "It is hard for you to kick against the goads." The remnant of your people have long rejected Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, and still reject him, though every generation has less excuse for themselves than had their fathers. The evidence in his favor increases every generation, at least as respects your people: for your prospects of a Messiah must necessarily weaken and diminish every year. It is now utterly impossible that you ever can have any person in the character of a Messiah, in whom your prophecies can at all meet, even upon your own principles of interpretation. You will have to reject the interpretations of your most learned Rabbims, as well as of the Christian Doctors, before you can sustain the pretensions of any aspirant whatever. I repeat it, sir, it is utterly impossible that you can ever have a Messiah, in whose favor your own Prophets can speak, according to your own principles of interpretation.

The apologies which you offer for your rejection of Jesus our Saviour, in whom we trust, show how the spirit of slumber has fallen upon you, and how weak your expectations are; how heartless and how hopeless are all the sons of Jacob. Alas! how fallen! Your

fathers were never excelled in all that ornaments the human intellect. The wisdom of philosophy was folly in contrast with the wisdom of your wise men, and the best reasonings of Pagan orators were but the scintillations of light, in comparison with the pleadings of your seers and prophets. But, my dear sir, how can you satisfy yourself with your own reasonings against Jesus of Nazareth? or can you satisfactorily balance all the thousand arguments in his favor with even a few objections, such as you offer, had they even all the plausibility which you attempt to give them? Then may not the Atheist urge his objections against the very existence of God—against the concurrent testimony of myriads of voices which are ever audible in his praise? All nature speaks, and but the Atheist demurs!

What, sir, is that truth in physics, in morals, in politics, in economics, which has not been objected to? And where and when lived the lawgiver, prophet, priest, or king, against whose pretensions and whose right to respect every tongue was mute, and every lip was silent? Wonder not, then, that one whose pretensions incomparably transcended all others, should have been the object of not only a few, but of many objections, and that when he came even to his own country his own people received him not.

But to your objections let me turn my attention. To your premises I must demur. "The promise was not especially for the benefit of the Jewish nation, nor for the express purpose of effecting their temporal and spiritual deliverance." Their benefit and their deliverance were, indeed, prominent objects in the promise of the Messiah, but very far from "the express purpose" of his mission. "In thy seed shall *all the families* of the earth be blessed" was the first promise to your father Abraham. The land of Canaan to you was special, and that the Messiah should tender deliverance to the Jew first was just as special; but that he should "reign over the Gentiles," and that "in his name the Gentiles should trust," were matters so often declared and so fully expressed, that we know not how it is possible to mistake them. The nations are promised to the Messiah in the 2d Psalm: "The heathen were to be his inheritance." "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles, the kings of Sheba, and Seba shall offer gifts; yea, all kings shall fall down before him." "And in that day there shall be a Root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign to the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." Isaiah is very express, as well as David, in teaching us that the Messiah should "bring forth judgment and salvation to the Gentiles."

Whether your first objection has any weight remains to be tried. It is this, that "he was to be called *David*, and not Jesus." This is its strength. That he was to be a son of David all agree; but that he was to be called David is not apparent from your proofs.

The passages in Ezekiel which speak of the future destinies of your people, of the gathering of the whole nation under one shepherd, speak not of the *name* to be given to the Messiah at his coming; but that "David his servant shall be that one shepherd." Hence you infer that the Messiah's personal name must be *David*. On the same

principle you reject John the Harbinger, because he was not called *Elijah*. It seems that you are much more puzzled to find objections against Jesus than were your fathers. No Jew urged this objection in the times of Jesus, or of John; but then the Rabbis had not learned that there must be *two* Messiahs to fill up all that is said of a suffering and a reigning Messiah. Hence they have since referred to Ben Joseph of the tribe of Ephraim, who is to be poor and contemptible, and undergo great indignities, all that is said of the sufferings of the Christ; and to Ben David of the tribe of Judah, who is to be victorious and to conquer all the earth before him, all that is said of the glories and triumphs of the Messiah. Ben David was to reign on earth forever, and to raise from the dead all the Israelites that had ever lived, and among them Ben Joseph the first Messiah. If there be *two*, there can be no person called "*the* Messiah;" and thus, in their ingenuity to elude the prophecies so applicable to the true Messiah, who was first to suffer and then to be glorified, they have made it impossible that there can ever be any one who may be called "*the* Messiah!" This gloss was unknown to all the Jews till long since Jesus rose from the dead. But there is another oversight in this matter. As your first Messiah is to be killed and all his followers routed, you have discouraged all from believing in him and owning him, and have in fact admonished them not to associate with Ben Joseph that they may be victorious under Ben David.

But to return: "David his servant" obviously refers to the natural root of the family which was to preside, according to an everlasting compact, over the redeemed Israel. Not that David the son of Jesse, who is here literally referred to, but that one of that house and lineage, should reign over them. Thus men speak of all the dynasties that have ever reigned—"the Pharaohs," "the Ptolemies," "the Cesars," "the Caputs," "the Popes," &c. His name is moreover foretold by Isaiah: "Immanuel," "the Counsellor," "the mighty God," "the Father of the everlasting age," "the Prince of Peace;" "on the throne of David he shall sit," &c. He is called "Messiah," "the Lord," and "Jehoshua," "Jesus," or "Saviour." Isaiah vii. ix. and xix. So that his *personal* name was foretold to be Jesus, Jehoshua, or Saviour—his *official* name, Messiah, Shiloh, or Christ. *David reigns in the person of his son, now sitting upon his throne over all the world, Jew and Gentile.* But this mere play upon the word *David* deserves no such elaborate discussion as is necessary to develope and confirm the above *italicised* proposition. It resembles your national regard for Levi, and your pleadings for the priesthood of Aaron, because it was said, "Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually." "Thus saith the Lord, If you can break my covenant of the day and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and the Levites the priests my ministers." Now do you not contend as much for the priesthood of Levi from these words, as

you do for a literal David with a sword of steel to avenge your enemies. Yet is it not as positively declared that your Messiah should arise a priest after the order of Mechizedeck, (Ps. cx.) as that he should be of the tribe of Judah? But the above prophecy which I have now quoted from Jeremiah xxiii. is preceded by another promise which I have not quoted, and which, when added to the above, refutes all your glosses upon the ancient prophets. It is this: "Thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." This promise concerning David and Levi might convince you that your objections are nothing, light as vanity, against Jesus of Nazareth. On the supposition that Jesus of Nazareth was not the Messiah nor the son of David, this absolute promise of Jehovah has fallen to the ground for almost 2000 years. David has not had a man to sit upon his throne, nor has Levi had a priest to offer an offering to the Lord for almost 2000 years, unless Jesus be the son of David, and his people a priesthood to the Lord. Mark this, I pray you!

Your allusion to the genealogy of Matthew and Luke are like those of our common enemies, the Deists—very slight and oblique. Matthew does not prove that the child Jesus, by his "*by law established father*," Joseph, had one drop of the blood of David in his person!! Now if he had proved that he was, *by his father*, of the seed of David—dont you see—and would you not have said, and said triumphantly, that he was an impostor? because he was to be, according to the most express prediction of Isaiah, THE SON OF A VIRGIN!! Strange that you should make the most exact verification of this prophecy an argument against the *only Saviour Jesus*, the son of David!!! And does not Luke prove, beyond all contradiction, that the mother of Jesus was a daughter of David; and consequently Jesus, having his whole humanity from her, had as much of the blood of David as was possible under any circumstance for any child that could be born in the times allotted for the Messias? But I must defer my full answer to your objections till another month. So full, so express, so irrefragable are the arguments in confirmation of the Messiahship of Jesus, that I am willing to meet any Rabbi on the continent, and to show from the prophecies of your own prophets, from the concessions and glosses of the ancient Rabbis, and from history, that Jesus of Nazareth is in very deed that Messiah of whom Moses in the law and all the prophets did write.

Believe me, sir, to be a friend, benevolent and sincere, to every son of Abraham. EDITOR.

RELIGION IN CEYLON, ASIA.

Extract of a Letter from Rev. Miron Winslow, Missionary in Ceylon, to his brother in Dover, N. H. dated

"ODDOOVILLE, JAFFNA. Dec. 17, 1830.

"We have to speak of the goodness of the Lord in granting us a refreshing from His presence, when we were almost ready to despair of his appearing to build up His kingdom, in these desolate places. During all the early part

of the year, we were mourning on account of our own deadness, and the want of life in the native church. Some peculiar trials also made us feel more than usual our extreme weakness and insufficiency of ourselves, for the work in which we are engaged. In July, a day of fasting and prayer was observed in this mansion, on account of the low state of religion among us, and some falls in the church. From that time a little more life was visible; but nothing *particularly* encouraging until the monthly prayer meeting in *October*, when a spirit of prayer was somewhat remarkably manifested, especially in regard to our own children, of whom several in the mission are old enough to know the value of their souls. This meeting was followed by some awakening among the children, and by more seriousness throughout all our families. A spirit of prayer for divine aid, and expectation of it, was more prevalent than before. On the 21st of the month was our quarterly communion, when the members of the church at the five different stations come together, in one place, to the table of the Lord. It was an interesting season, and the preacher on the occasion was much affected, in addressing his brethren on the state of the native church. It became a time of heart searching—of humiliation—and yet of joy in the Holy Ghost. Encouraged by some appearances of revival in the native brethren and sisters, and by their own feelings, two of our number went to the Seminary at Batticotta that evening, and in connexion with the brethren who reside at the station, spent the two remaining week days in private conversation, in social and public meetings with the students; who with one consent laid aside their studies, and in most cases seemed to make it their *business* to seek the salvation of their souls. Their rooms of retirement for devotional purposes were lighted up until midnight, especially on Saturday and Sunday evenings; and in them individuals, or companies of two, three, or more, were earnestly, and in some cases with much anguish, calling on the Lord for mercy. The Sabbath was a very interesting day.—Convictions where begun were increased, and new cases occurred. On Monday evening a prayer meeting of the families at the station, with two brethren from other stations, seemed to be attended with a peculiar manifestation of the divine presence. Two of the older children, who were present, could not close their eyes that night until they had endeavored to give themselves to the Lord; and there is some reason to hope they were enabled to do it in sincerity. The good work also increased in the Seminary, and the brethren from the other stations continued to come and assist in directing the inquirers to Christ. By the middle of the week almost every member of the Seminary (100 in all) was under concern of mind, or rejoicing in hope—and in a majority of the cases, though by no means in all, the exercises of their minds seemed deep, and promised to be lasting. On Thursday was the quarterly meeting of all our School-masters, and those of the church, (about 105) including some school visiters. This was held at Batticotta, and the addresses made, were in the spirit of the awakening. They were attended by a blessing. Most of the masters not previously aroused were stirred up to inquire earnestly after the way of salvation, and several of them have, there is reason to hope, closed sincerely with the terms of mercy through Christ Jesus.

At all the other stations, and nearly at the same time as at Batticotta, the influence of the Spirit were also manifested; particularly in the Preparatory School at Tillipally, and the Female Boarding School at Oodooville—in both of which all the older children are awakened, and several of them hopefully converted. Some also not connected with any of our stations, and many of the children of the native free schools are affected. We held a general meeting of the largest children in the free schools on the 18th of last month, at Oodooville, where 800 were present. Of these (at that time or since) more than 100 professed to have commenced praying to God, and most of them a resolution to live as christians, however opposed by parents or others. Our monthly prayer meeting in November was very interesting. The subject brought forward was from the text, "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse," &c. With the native members in union prayer meetings, attended

by church members and inquirers from different stations, we have also had some very precious seasons. We trust the good work is still in progress.—Help us to praise the Lord for his mercy and grace.

I should add that the revival of the work of the Lord is also manifest in the town of Jaffna, where many are inquiring what shall we do to be saved? Pray for us all, that we may not hinder the Lord's work, but that we may be instrumental in extending it, until all the perishing heathen around us are converted."

From the above document it appears, as we have long since stated, that the religion taught to the Pagans by each sect is the religion which they profess and teach at home. It produces the same complexion of things among the natives who embrace it, which appears among its propagators here. They are taught the same phraseology and appropriated sense of biblical expressions, which obtain among the originators of the mission at home. Thus we read of "a refreshing from His presence"—"His appearing to build up His kingdom"—"insufficiency of ourselves for the work in which we are engaged"—"a spirit of prayer was somewhat remarkably manifested"—"a time of joy in the Holy Ghost"—"a peculiar manifestation from the divine presence"—"the good work increased in the Seminary"—"pray that we may not hinder the Lord's work." To these are added the sectarian appendages—"the monthly prayer meeting"—"our quarterly communion"—"a day of fasting and prayer"—"the Sabbath was a very interesting day"—"several of them, there is *reason to hope*, have *closed* sincerely with the terms of mercy through Christ Jesus."

The writer seems to have been hard pressed for something to say to raise the expectation of his friends; hence the document evinces the coldness, stiffness, and formality of its author. It is true he "mourns over his own deadness," as well as the "want of life (i. e. deadness) in the *native* church;" but he saw "some appearances of a revival in the native brethren and sisters."

One would imagine, from the style of the historiographers of revivals, that they operated like some influenza or endemic. Hence the so frequent adoption of the medical nomenclature, or the popular phrases used by physicians in describing the prognosis and pathology of diseases. In the infected region, or in the vicinity of a revival, every occurrence is presented in the language of an epidemic. Mr. Winslow speaks a good deal in this style. Hearken to the following description: "The rooms of retirement for devotional purposes were lighted up until midnight, especially on Saturday and Sunday evenings, and in them (the sick) individuals, or companies of two, three, or more, were earnestly, and in some (desperate) cases with much anguish, calling on the Lord for mercy. Convictions where begun were increased, and *new cases* occurred." This reminds me of a description once given me of a revival in New England, in the days of Timothy Dwight, D. D. It was usual to have persons, whose office resembled that of those who watch the sick, to go round the village and visit the convicted. In the mornings and evenings they reported the new cases, and detailed the symptoms of the old ones.

Well, (said an enquirer to one of the watches) how is Goodrich this morning?

W. A little easier, had a pretty good night, and I think is likely to get religion.

E. And how is Samuel?

W. No better. He is in great anguish, and refuses to be comforted. The Rev. Mr. J—— visited him this morning, and represented his symptoms to be promising; but he could not raise him: he left him as dejected as he found him.

E. Tell me, did you hear of any new cases?

W. Yes—no less than *five* new cases occurred at the prayer meeting at Deacon T's last night. Two of them are said to be hopeful—the others are doubtful. Parson E—— recommended Doddridge's "Rise and Progress," and induced two of them to obtain and read the work.

E. And tell me, did you hear from Sophronia?

W. O yes: she had a fine night, and is thought to have experienced a happy change. She is now relieved from pain, and rejoices much in having got relief. And many of those who were at first cast down are now quite at rest in their minds, having found peace to their souls.

In this way they were, in those days, accustomed to speak of one another, during the prevalence of a revival. We discover much of the same unnatural, artificial, and mechanical representation of things, in the teeming accounts of revivals, among all the sects in the country, which are now filling the columns of the "Indexes, Stars, Heralds, and Registers" of the present day. The sects, orthodox and heterodox, are now in one mighty campaign of proselytism; and all seem to agree that the spirit of Revivals is subject to the will of man.

For our own part, we could heartily rejoice in the news of the day, if we could persuade ourselves that those who are stirred up were moved by the Spirit of God; that those "who experience a hope" were truly converted to God; and that those who unite with a sect were translated from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God's own Son. But we want evidence; we want to see the fruits of the Holy Spirit; we want to see the proselytes walking in the commandments of Jesus: for if any one say, I know him, and keep not his commandments, he is a liar, says John, and the truth is not in him.

The Asiatic revival has called for our notice; and had it not been narrated in the Christian Index, as one of its Revivals, it is probable we should not have bestowed upon it a passing remark. Take it all in all, it is no way flattering to the prospects of them who are looking to Ceylon for the fruits of missionary labor, under the patronage of such institutions. EDITOR.

MORMONISM IN VERMONT.

From the Burlington Sentinel.

Mr. JOHN STEWART, of Bakersfield, put an end to his existence, May 19th, by hanging himself on a tree. The cause of this dreadful deed was the following:—

About two years ago, a man by the name of Davidson came into this vicinity, pretending to be endowed with the Holy Spirit, and to be inspired of God to prophesy of things to come. He is a disciple, he tells us, of Dilks, who has figured in the state of Ohio for three or four years past. Davidson pretends that Dilks has almighty power, and is God himself. He has gained quite a number of proselytes in the towns of Bakersfield, Fairfax, and Fairfield. He wears his hair long, and pretends to a great deal of piety. He preaches that Jesus Christ is a woman, and quite inferior to Dilks; that the Millennium is to take place in 1832—Philadelphia is the place designated where Dilks is to assemble his followers, and then the rest of mankind are to be swept from the face of the earth, and Dilks and his followers are to inherit their possessions.

This Davidson has got about thirty disciples in the east part of Fairfield and in the west part of Bakersfield. They meet together every Sabbath and carry on in a manner most shocking to human feelings. They roll naked on the floor, both men and women, and commit other sins too revolting to be mentioned. But this is but a faint picture of their shameful conduct. Modesty forbids that I should utter the whole. A few days since they pretended to crucify a woman, and put her in a box and began to pray over her, in order to raise her from the dead; but being wearied with lying shut up in a close box, she finally came forth with her own accord before they intended.

They have a woman among them by the name of Thompson, who pretends now that *she* is Jesus Christ, and baptises Davidson's followers. She sprinkles them, in the first place, with flour. The rest of the ceremony I will omit, for modesty's sake. She performs her baptism, however, in the name of the Holy Trinity. A man who once represented the town of Fairfax in our General Assembly, I understand, was baptised by this woman at the house of a man by the name of Gardner, in Fairfield. Gardner's house is the place of their resort.

The man who hanged himself was threatened by Mrs. Thompson that unless he immediately obeyed her commands he should be sent forthwith to hell-fire! She had made him swear by the living God, on his knees, that he would be true to the prophet Davidson and his people, and do whatever he was required to do by him or herself. She then required of him things too horrid and indecent to be named. The poor, simple man, went to his home and put a period to his life.

It is thought by many judicious persons that Randall, of Franklin, who murdered his family a short time since, was deluded into that atrocious act by believing Davidson's doctrine. He was one of his disciples, in part, at least.

There is another man among them that is beginning to be crazy. I believe the whole of it is the work of the evil one, and that Davidson goes about and preaches only for the sake of doing all the harm he can to religion.

Immediately after Stewart hanged himself, several men agreed to tar and feather Davidson. One of the men, with several lads, went to Gardner's with their apparatus for tarring, and found Davidson delivering a lecture. They waited awhile for others to help them; but no one came: the man entered the room and dragged out Davidson, and the boys applied the tar. The others undertook to rescue Davidson, but shared the same fate. The tar was faithfully applied to their pates, in turn. A man from Colchester fled to the chamber, but was pursued to his retreat, and was spared by being very penitent, and promising that he would not be seen in Fairfield again.

I have just been conversing with a gentleman of undoubted veracity, who informs me that he has been present, and saw with his own eyes a man get down and kiss the floor at the command of Mrs. Thompson; and says that this is but a faint picture, that I have given above, of the base conduct of Davidson and his followers. L.

Fairfield, June 3, 1831.

CHRISTIAN IMMERSION RIDICULED.

THE clergy, it is said, about Lexington and Frankfort, Ky. are the authors and distributors of a pamphlet, written in doggerel verse, to ridicule the ancient gospel. The writers and publishers, it appeared, were equally ashamed to inscribe their names upon it. It is likely to be an efficient instrument in the hands of the orthodox to check the progress of public inquiry!! But, alas for religion! if this be one of the means which the Holy Spirit blesses to sustain it!! The clergy know best how to suit the consciences and the taste which they have formed, and to cherish that *holy spirit* which they preach; and it is presumed the following poem is in accordance with that conscience, taste, and *holy spirit* which they commend. As we afford our readers a specimen of *all* the weapons of the opposers of reformation, we shall treat them to a few lines from this "*sacred* poem," of 21 pages:—

"All *sects* are wrong, he's often said,
"They should be number'd with the dead;
Confessions, creeds, serve to divide:
They must, they shall be thrown aside.
I little care what men believe,
Provided they *my faith* receive,
And come to me, with me unite,
And think my views and plans are right,
And *swear allegiance to the water*—
As for the rest. 'tis little matter;
Whate'er they think, whate'er they do,
Can naught avail; they're subjects true.
Should they get drunk, and swear and lie,
Steal, and the word of God deny,
And curse the Prince of Peace and Love,
They have an Advocate above:—
They've taken the baptismal vow,—
Their sins are gone—no danger now."

"Though your sins be black as jet,
Never mind to mourn or fret—
Come to me, no longer dream,
I will plunge you in the stream,
Up you'll come in garments white,
Holy as a saint of light,
Come to me each son and daughter,
Here's the "gospel in the water."

O ye blinded generation,
Wont you have this *cheap* salvation?
Wont you have your sins remitted?
Wont you be for glory fitted?
Will you follow *creeds, confessions*,—
Bow to Presbyt'ries and Sessions,
'Till you're doom'd to death and slaughter?
Here's the "gospel in the water."

PAUL AND FAITH RIDICULED.

If ridicule like the above be a test of truth, what shall we think of the reputation of Paul and his gospel in Rome, when such poems as the following, alluded to in Rom. iii. 8. might have been written by

a Roman rhymester with equal justice against Paul as this exhibits towards us? We translate the following infidel effusion into the same doggerel as a specimen of the style in which Roman punsters and enemies of the gospel ridiculed Paul. We may suppose that many such ballads were written in Paul's time; and no person need ask me where I came by the original from which we made the following translation. Let it be supposed to have been written A. D. 64, by some person who knew as much about Paul, and loved him as well as the authors of this pamphlet know and love the translator. If Paul and faith were so ridiculed by infidels, no wonder that *unbelieving christians* can make an effort to ridicule christian immersion:—

One Saul, a Jew, from Tarsus came
To mighty Rome; and changed his name
From Saul to Paul, and told them all
That on the road he had a call
To preach to all the Roman race
A gospel made of faith and grace.

This preacher Paul then wore a chain,
And well, indeed, deserv'd the same;
For sure he did the world upturn,
And taught all men the gods to spurn,
Our sages all he made out fools,
And call'd our priests the stateman's tools.
At home, abroad, he was a pest,
For neither Jew nor Greek had rest;
Their Moses and our sages stood
Alike his scorn. The wise and good,
Men of renown, of every name,
He hurl'd to Pluto's dark domain.

He prated still of faith and grace,
And vow'd they'd save the human race,
And swore that if we would believe
We should eternal life receive,
But if we did this faith despise,
We never could to heaven rise;
But must, with all the impious crew,
Soon, as to time we bid adieu,
Make our abode in Erebus,
And find a home in Tartarus.

Around him throng'd a wicked race
Of outlaws vile, that needed grace;
Murderers of fathers, mothers,
Sons and daughters, friends and brothers,
Manstealers, thieves, robbers, haters
Of gods and men, liars, traitors,
Winebibbers, vile adulterers,
Harlots, railers, and revilers,
Miscreant slaves, and all the rabble
With joy and gladness heard him babble
Bout one Jesus, the sinner's friend,
Who came from heaven to this end
That sinners pardon might receive
If they on him would now believe.

This Jesus was a sinner too,
A poor, forlorn, ignoble Jew,
Whom Pontius Pilate crucified,
Because our Cesar he defied,
Despis'd the gods, and sought to find
A party suited to his mind.

Most worthy he in all the land,
To be the head of such a band!
Most worthy they of such a chief,
To promise pardon through belief!
For plain it was, if virtue be
The path to immortality,
Not one of all this cursed train
Could ever hope to live again;
But if all virtue come through faith,
As Paul the babbler always saith,
'Tis easy then to find relief
For all their vices, in belief!

No wonder, then, that Paul could raise
In Rome a temple to his praise,
And find a crowd in every land
To purchase pardon at his hand;
For if a thought can full atone
For all the crimes a man has done,
Who would refuse that thought to give,
That in his crimes he still might live?
No strolling Jew his wares did sell
So cheap, as Paul release from hell.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY & METAPHYSICAL REGENERATION. *NO. III.*

DEAR SIR,

IN my former essay upon the subject of "total depravity," we showed, from Milner and Mosheim, two orthodox historians, that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was assigned by the Synod of Dort, held in the year 1618, in order to decide the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, a political council, composed of political clergymen from England, Scotland, and the Netherlands, and provinces—WERE ABSOLUTELY UNKNOWN IN THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Mark it well, reader, Dr. Mosheim says the controversy about calvinistic election, particular redemption, special calvinistic operations of the Spirit before faith, and in order to produce faith, total depravity and final perseverance "were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the christian church." We proved most incontestably, that in the days of Moses, Joshua, David, and Isaiah, men did choose good and refuse evil; they ceased to do evil, they *learned* to do well; that in the days of Solomon, God threatened to laugh at the calamity of the Jews, because they *would* not incline to his reproof—because they hated knowledge, and did not *choose* the fear of Jehovah—did not incline to his counsel; contemptuously re-

jected all his reproof. Prov. i. 24—34. The eloquent Isaiah said, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return (reform) to Jehovah, and he will compassionate him, and unto our God, for he aboundeth in forgiveness"—in immersion. So that we see from all these great and infallible witnesses, that the Jews had the *power* of choosing and of obeying God's commands. Paul, the greatest of the Apostles, the Apostle to us Gentiles, says, (Philemon, i. 5, 14.) "Not of *necessity*, but *willingly;* having no *necessity*, but *hath power over his own will*." We demonstrated that the primitive christians of the four first centuries, and Augustine the old calvinistic saint, the grandfather of the *Five Points*, all preached the same doctrine;—that Calvin and the Calvin-makers say that men act *freely*. All the orthodox preachers do the same in "times of revivals;" they tell men to repent, to believe, to obey the gospel, to pray, to come up to the anxious seats;—let the clergy pray for you, pray for yourselves, join the church, get religion, &c. They do not tell men to curse and swear, steal and lie, until they are illuminated by calvinistic grace, till God stops you by his omnipotent hand; till his spirit operates upon you and regenerates you. In these popular excitements they do not preach you can and you cannot, you shall and you shall not, you will and you wont, and you'll be damn'd if you dont.

As "Doctor Noel's friend Dillard has addressed his essays on total depravity "to the friends of evangelical truth," I consider myself *personally* addressed, because I am a friend to every word and sentence which any one of the four Evangelists or twelve Apostles wrote. I understand the word "*evangelical*" to be derived from the word *evangelist?* I shall, therefore, examine his dry and insipid metaphysics, his lame and disjointed sentences, and his empty and hollow-sounding philosophy—by the four Evangelists. I cannot find the phrase "total depravity" in the vocabulary of the four Evangelists, nor in the Prophets, nor Acts, nor Epistles, nor in the Revelation; therefore, I cannot find such an idea, for words are the signs of ideas, the dress or etching of ideas. As it was not coined in the mind of "*Evangelical Truth*," I therefore concluded that it was coined in the mind of Doctor Antichrist, and accordingly I turned to the first chapter of the *Clergy's* Bible, and found written in the tenth verse of the first chapter, close by the following phrases, infallibillty of the Pope and Clergy, the seven holy sacraments of the church, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, sublapsarianism, auricular confession, the awful and incomprehensible doctrine of trinity in unity, and unity in trinity, *et cetera*; "The phrase '*total depravity*' was christened by Austin, baptized by Calvin, and immersed by Doctors Gill and Fuller." The Clergy say they believe in "total depravity"—they mean they imagine, or think it is true; they cannot believe it, for there is nothing written to believe about it; therefore they cannot believe it upon God's testimony, for he has said nothing about it, nor about transubstantiation.

Having shown that there is nothing in the Bible about "total de-

pravity," we shall show that reason says nothing about it.—
First let us examine the phrase: "*Totally*" means wholly, entirely, altogether, perfectly, completely in all its parts. *Examples*:—We say the horse is *totally* blind; which means he is stone blind, he cannot see, he is perfectly blind. The man is *totally* ruined; he is completely ruined, he cannot be any further ruined. He is *totally* deaf; he cannot be more deaf. He is *totally* dumb, *totally* dead, *totally* depraved—means, then, according to the rules of logic, completely depraved in all the parts; so that it is impossible for man, or men, to be any more depraved. If they were to perpetrate all the unlawful, atrocious, and lewd acts, they could not be any more depraved; nor would such a character be any worse than the most pure, amiable, and accomplished female upon earth—for this reason: the popular depravity admits not the degrees of *deprared*, *more deprared*, and *most depraved:* The virtuous, benevolent, and enlightened philosopher and scholar is as much depraved as the obdurate, hardened, outlaw and culprit in the penitentiary, or as the most fiend-like pirate upon the high seas. The man ironed and blindfolded at the gallows is no more depraved than when his mother smiled upon him in her lap; yea, he deserved as much to be ironed, chained, and hung, at three days old, as at forty-five years of age: he was born totally depraved, he lived totally depraved, and he only died totally depraved. So says Doctor Orthodoxy, and who dare deny it? So says Calvinism, and so says Robert Owen's doctrine of unalterable and unavoidable circumstances; and he who does not believe it, is a most "incorrigible and damnable heretic."

In the day of judgment will men say to God, and will he allow the plea, that they were so "totally dspraved" that they could not believe that he loved them, that his Son died for them, and that they could not obey his gospel? Will they tell the Judge that they were reprobated, or, which is the same thing, that they were not elected from all eternity? Will they tell him that he never sent the calvinistic operations upon them, therefore they could not believe him to be a God of love, truth, and justice? Do the Judges of our Courts allow the criminal to say that he was so "totally depraved" that he could not avoid stealing and murdering? Do masters listen to this plea from their servants? Do parents forgive their children's disobedience upon the score of "total depravity? No! Then the doctrine is unreasonable as well as unscriptural. It is not preached in heaven, nor upon any part of this earth, except in the land of orthodoxy. There is neither reason nor scripture to support such an idea. Admitting that men are "totally depraved, and that both reason and revelation teach this doctrine, then no man can believe it upon the authority of revelation, until he is *previously* operated upon to make him believe that he is totally depraved; nor can he believe the creed, nor the preacher whom he pays to sing his dogmas to him monthly, until the Ghost of the moderns makes him believe before he has any faith in the Bible. If, then, he thinks or imagines that he is "totally depraved," it is not upon the authority of the Bible, the creed, nor the preacher, that he

believes it; for this he cannot do until some spirit reveals it to him before he can believe it.

Men "totally depraved" can believe one another, and can believe the devil before and since "the fall," and can believe the whole system of lies taught them by the devil and his clergy, in the Pagan, the Catholic, the Mahometan, and in all the sectarian religions; but he cannot believe the God of all truth without previous and antecedent calvinistic operations. The very throat of the present war between the Bible and the Systems, the pivot and hinge on which the door turns, is "special operations before faith in order to produce faith;" yet the advocates of this system have not attempted to prove it, but persecute others because they will not take it for granted, or believe it because the clergy say it is so. *This doctrine is the* HONEY *of a poisoned cup, and it is the sting of a serpent's embrace!*

We perceive some marks of goodness even in brutes. Doves and turtles are chaste in their connexions. "Even the stork in the heavens knoweth her season; and the turtle, and the swallow, and the crane observe the time of their coming." Elephants are modest, reasonable, and religious in their own way. Dogs are grateful and affectionate, and discover great sagacity in running this way and that, when in pursuit of their masters or of game. Apes are pious towards their young. Bees and ants exhibit great wisdom, industry, and great political economy and government in the management of their subjects. A lion possesses great magnanimity in walking over the man who falls before him. The horse manifests great courage and strength, combined with wisdom. But I must close this essay. Such heresy as this is worse than all the pride, avarice, ambition, lewdness, and all the other crimes which are committed in the land of orthodoxy. It is more deadly than the fangs and stings of the aspick. I shall be told that men are too depraved to believe and obey the ancient gospel; but not too sick to be cured, not too ignorant to be taught science, government, and morals, and not too hungry to eat. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear;" he that hath eyes to see, let him read this essay; he that hath a heart to believe, let him believe the Bible, and let his hands do what his heart believes.

MOSES.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.—*Part 2d.*

AUSTIN AND TIMOTHY.

Austin. I HAVE longed for this evening ever since we parted. It appears more than a month since our last interview. I have had a hundred thoughts, which I wished to have suggested; and I fear that now, when I see your face, I will not remember even a tithe of them.

Timothy. I am glad to see you, brother Austin, and to hear that the subject has engrossed so much of your attention; and I doubt not that you will be able to recall your most important thoughts in the course of our interview, and perhaps some new ones may occur which our last conversation did not suggest.

A. I have marked down on a slip of paper some questions which I wished to propound, and these may recall some of the difficulties which

have agitated me so much these two weeks past. Indeed some of my difficulties are involved in these questions—but first I must tell you that while I do admit that all the power which is necessary to conversion is *moral* power, and that this is wholly contained in, and exhibited by arguments or motives, and that consequently the moral influence which the Holy Spirit can exert upon our minds is in the arguments or motives which the New Testament contains, still I cannot reconcile this to some sayings which I find in the book.

T. Let us have a sample of these irreconcileable sayings.

A. I will not say that they are irreconcileable, but only that they appear so to me. For example—Paul speaks of the word coming in power, "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." It would seem, then, that there is a power apart from the word necessary to producing that moral change of which you have spoken, and of the necessity of which we are both agreed. Now my difficulty is, that if all the moral power which is necessary to effect that great change in the heart of man be in the word, a greater power was exhibited on some occasions than was necessary to the salvation of the individuals who were the subjects of it; which appears to be at variance with your reasonings in our last interview.

T. To this passage you might add many others, such as Rom. xv. 19. "I will not speak of any of those things which Christ has not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders *by the power of the Spirit of God;* so that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ"—"Yea," says Peter of his fellow Apostles, 1 Ep. i. 12. "they have preached the gospel to you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven"—"For," says Paul to the Thessalonians, 1 Ep. i. . "our gospel came not to you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance." This power of the Holy Spirit is also called "*the hand of the Lord*," Acts xi. 21. "And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord." And thus the Lord had opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended to Paul, Acts xvi. 14. But all these passages, and many others to the same effect, only prove that the arguments of the Holy Spirit are of two sorts, words and actions; and the actions are only to confirm the word, to enable persons to do as the Thessalonians did, receive the word with much assurance. Hence the Lord not only promised to confirm or prove the testimony of the Apostles, but did actually go forth with them, *confirming the word* with all power, and signs and wonders, and thus opened the hearts of the hearers to receive the gospel. Had the gospel not been confirmed by demonstrations of the power of God inimitable, no one's heart or ears would have been opened to attend to it. But when it came not in word only, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, they could not but attend to it. But all this was implied in my remarks to you the other evening, when it was said that the power of every argument is in its *meaning.* And unless it be made certain it has no meaning at all. All that is necessary to overcome the world,

is to be assured that the gospel is true. Its arguments can have no weight, unless they are regarded as indubitably certain. That Jesus Christ will give eternal life to all who obey him, is an argument to obedience; but it is not only necessary that the words be intelligible, but that his ability and faithfulness to bestow eternal life be indubitably proved: and this requires the demonstrations of the Spirit and of power.

A. I anticipated that this would be your method of getting out of the difficulty.

T. I do not get out of the difficulty, for there is none. Every person must know that any proposition must be proved before there is any argument in it; and the proof must be of the same nature with the proposition. If the proposition be merely human, good human testimony or evidence will sustain it; but if it be divine and supernatural, no less than divine and supernatural proof can sustain it. Paul's argument in the passage quoted is, in brief, "I sought not to persuade you Corinthians by human eloquence or the powers of rhetoric, by curious logical or rhetorical orations, but I came declaring only the testimony of God concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and by the demonstrations of the presence of God's Spirit and power I proved it; and so your assurance or faith rests not on my reasonings, but on the power of God which accompanied that testimony.

A. I am satisfied with this resolution of the difficulty. You understand all the gifts of the Holy Spirit mentioned in the New Testament necessary to confirm the testimony.

T. No, sir; this is not all. The gifts of the Holy Spirit had more to do than this. They were necessary to develope the religion, as well as to prove it. Hence all the diversities of gifts mentioned 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv. chapters, are classified under two heads; first, those which revealed the religion, and those which proved it. The spiritual gifts necessary to teach the religion were "the word of wisdom," "the word of knowledge," "the gift of prophesy," "the interpretation of tongues," and to these might, in one sense, be added "the discerning of spirits." To confirm the religion there were "faith," or a firm persuasion that they were able to perform miracles; "the gift of healing diseases;" "powers," or an ability to perform such works as Peter did on Ananias and Sapphira, and Paul on Bar Jesus; "the gift of foreign tongues:" this was necessary to teach all nations, but as necessary to confirm the word; and the gift of "inworking," or imparting spiritual gifts to others by the imposition of hands. But on these gifts I would advise you to read the 2d volume of the Christian Baptist, as they are expatiated on in that volume at considerable length. This I advise to prevent mistakes concerning our sentiments on this very important subject.

A. Well, now I am reminded of one of my difficulties, and that I may have it fully examined, I will propose one of my questions — Why is it that the Apostles exhorted their converts "to pray in the Holy Spirit," "to quench not the Spirit," "to be filled with the Spirit"?

O. vol. 2 for T Norton. T Clapp, Mentor, O. vols. 1 and 2 for A Wilmott. L Hunt, Huntsburg, O. vol. 2 for E Clark and himself. L Smith, Chardon, O. vol. 2. E W Ranney, Freedom, O. vol. 1. W Hayden, Austintown, O. vol. 2 for J Fuller, C Judd, J G Sawyer, S Russel, J Colt, T Fenton, E Baits, M Bentley, A Drake, H Weston, A Pomroy, and H Reid, and vol. 1 for J Calvin. B Austin, Warren, O. vols. 1 & 2. D Leavitt, Warren, O. vol. 2. D Ewal, Warren, O. vol. 2. A Martin, West Liberty, vol. 2. W Matthews, Bethany, Va. vols. 1 & 2. Z Darnall, Spring Hill, Ind. vols. 1 and 2 for J Gregg, and vol 1 for A M'Coy and G M'Laughlin; also, vol. 2 for S Lowe, and 1 dollar for J Sanders. W P Payne, Flat Rock, Ky. vol. 2 for G Dwelly, H Bonta and himself. M Winans, Jamestown, O. vol. 2 for Blain & Lockhart. W Fleming, Fleming's, Ten. vol. 1, and 1 dollar for vol. 2. G Fossett, Scottsville, Pa. vol. 2. N H Turner, Locust Creek, Va. vol. 2 for N Anthony, R T White, J Winston, T J Anderson, and himself. J G Ellis, Dry Creek, Ky. vol. 2. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ind. vol. 2 for J Goodlander, W Thompson, R Kulb, J Dawbenspeck, and himself. E A Smith, Danville, Ky. vol. 2 for W Marshall, J Mahan, and vols. 1 and 2 for E F Gaines. D Conner, Morristown, O. vol. 2. J Hartford, Steubenville, O. vol. 2. U Higgason, Thompson's Cross Roads, vol. 1 for H Timberlake and A Bowles; also, vol. 2 for R Hollins, Mary Farrar and J Lacy. T Jackman, Booneton, Mo. vol. 1 for S Stemmons, and vols 1 and 2 for P Jackman. P B Pendleton, Bruington, Va. vol. 2 for T Haynes, R Bagby, C Hill, H C Watkins, and W Campbell. J Prewitt, Fayette, Mo. vol. 2 for J Tussey, U Sebree, H Vivion, M Vivion, J A Shirley. J Upjohn, Cincinnati, O. vol. 2. J Colyer, Mount Vernon, Ky. vol. 2 for Postmaster, Crab Orchard, and T Paschal; also, 1 dollar for vol 1 for J Crawford. W Bosworth; Fredonia, N Y. 1 dollar for vol. 2. T S Alderson, Columbia, Ten. vol 2 for G Cathey, T Brooks, M Warfield, J Stone, T Brown and himself. J Stamps, Port Gibson, Ms. vol. 1 for G Humphrey, R Jones, A Hunt, 1 dollar; and vols. 1 and 2 for J Harper; also, vol. 2 for J Stamps, A Pate and J Pate. J T Jones, Cincinnati, O. vol. 2 for Mary Gano, J Brewin, Margaret Dickey, J Forbes, Eliza S Green, D Long, F Spencer, J Challin, vols. 1 and 2 for J Orr, and vol 1 for W Pierson and Mrs Judge Dawson. J Cabel, Steubenville, O. vol. 2. J Graft, Somerset, Pa. vol. 2 for R Urick and Louisa Robb. A T Morris, Tompkinsville, Ky. vol. 2 for J Wooten, W H Wooten, D Walker, G W M'Whorten and P Emmert. A Ellis, Georgetown, O. vol. 2 for N Sidwell and W Shepherd. J H Sallee, Felicity, O. vol. 2. J Dubois, Fairfield, Ind. vol. 2 for R Shafer. J Jones, Liberty, Ky. vol. 2 for C Huffawes, J Huffawes, J Wilkerson, J Warrence, J Hardwick, J A Dunn, and 1 dollar for A Hayden; also, W Rose, vols. 1 and 2, and vol. 1 for R Stevens. E S Walton, Clarksville, Ten. vol 2 for R Ross and himself, and 1 dollar for vol. 3. S W Hunt, Chilesburg, Ky vol. 2 for A Stewart, R Jones, T Ellis, T Parish and S Coleman. J Hawkins, Connersville, Ind. vol. 2 for A Woodyard, G Grunn, J M Green and J M'Connell. M Ryan, Sharpsburg, Ky. vol. for J Dougherty and vol. 1 for N Lane and himself. G C Gwathney, Louisville, Ky. vols. 1 and 2. J Cockens, Canonsburg, Pa. vol. 2. O Thomas, Roberts' Store, Ky. vol. 2 for W Danelson, J Brice, and 1 dollar for himself. S Ring, Ring's Mills, O. vol. 1 for J Lucas and vol 2 for himself, J Ficklin, Lexington, Ky. vol. 1 for W Brown, T Allen, T Graves, C L M'Gee, S Redd, J Randolph, J M Sutton, R Scott, W Vanpelt, J Stephens, and vol. 2 for J E Christian, J Higbie, E K Osborne, W Poindexter, T Rogers, W Sullivan, J Schooly, S Taylor, J Fishback; also, vols. 1 and 2 for T S Hays, J L Hickman, R Harris, D K Pitman and J Boswell. T B Puller, Enfield, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for T Valentine, J Cooke, C W Talliaffero, D Atkinson, G Sizer, W Redd, J Powell, T W Toler, F Dabney, P W Sweat, Y I Clements, J Lumpkin and himself, and vol. 2 for R Campbell, W Saunders, J C Talliaffero and D Elliott.

☞Receipts crowded out of this number shall appear in the next.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL—PRICE, $2 IN ADVANCE.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 8. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, AUGUST* 1, 1831. Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

NO. III.

The difference between the state of the Pentecostal Jews, and of Saul of Tarsus; and of the Gentiles when the Gospel was first preached to them.

IN my last number I showed, by the only divinely authenticated word that we have of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, that God remitted their sins through faith, before they were baptized. This is believed by some not to have been the case with the 3000 Pentecostal Jews, and Saul of Tarsus, from the expressions used by Peter to the former in Acts ch. ii, and by Ananias to Saul, as stated in Acts ch. xxii. I confess that the phraseology used in these cases, authorises this belief, in a great degree; and I have no controversy with those who entertain it; but I am unwilling that the order of the facts, and the phraseology that appeared and were employed at the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, as we have them recorded in the 10th and 11th chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, shall be thrown aside, and those which are recorded in reference to the Jews, be substituted for them. The Jews and the Gentiles were under entirely different circumstances, in many respects, which occasioned the difference that appeared in the facts, and in the style of address when the gospel was preached to them, and they were proselyted to it. The commission under which Peter acted, and the circumstances attending its execution, when he preached to the Gentiles, were as distinct and peculiar as if they had had no connexion whatever with the preaching of the gospel to the Jews on the day of Pentecost. And it is remarkable, that in no instance, in which he speaks of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, does he ever refer to the conversion of the 3000, or any thing that occurred in reference to them, as analogous to any thing that took place in the order, or facts, when the gospel was preached to the Gentiles; but he uniformly refers to those of the Jews, who were converted before the day of Pentecost, who had not participated in the murder of Jesus Christ, and upon whom the Holy Ghost was poured out, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, for facts of similarity. But let us attend to the distinctions that existed between the Jews and Gen-

Sometimes a whole congregation expressed all the same words at the same instant of time, the Holy Spirit suggesting to each individual all the same ideas and expressions at one and the same impulse. Thus the whole church kneeled down in Jerusalem, and with one accord, all uttered the same words at the same instant.

Pagans could neither know how, or for what to pray, unless they had been thus taught. Even the disciples of John and of Jesus, during the personal ministry of these two prophets, were taught by them how, and for what to pray. To pray in accordance with the economy under which we are placed, is a matter of some moment to all who have correct conceptions of God.

A. I cannot express the ideas which throng upon each other in my mind: but I must break silence and tell you, that really these are matters of which I have scarcely ever had a thought before; I never heard so much to explain to my satisfaction numerous passages in the Epistles, as I have now heard. I can now see why many things are connected together, which I never before understood. For example, "Quench not the Spirit" is succeeded by "despise not prophesyings," and that is succeeded by "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." I now see the association of ideas in the Apostle's mind. He exhorted the Thessalonians to stir up the gifts of the Spirit; to exercise the gift of prophesying; and, though some pretended to it who did not possess it, they were neither to contemn the gift, nor to cease from exercising it, but *prove* whether he that spake, spake by the Spirit; and so soon as this was proved, they were to hold fast that which was good. In this way my thoughts are running upon these passages as you proceed. I now understand another expression which I never before understood—"Be filled with the Spirit." I could not see, on the Calvinian or Arminian hypothesis, how any person could be *commanded* to be filled with the Spirit, any more than with any Divine attribute, inasmuch as that Spirit is not subject to the will of man; but as they cherished in their minds the word of Christ, and spake to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, they were filled with the Holy Spirit—and it was not incompatible with those gifts to *command* the christians to exercise them.

T. And if you would read the exhortations delivered to the Ephesians and Colossians, both of which letters were written about the same time, while Paul was a prisoner, and while the same associations of ideas were in his mind, you will see that Paul explains himself. The parallel passages in the two Epistles read thus: Ep. v. 18, 19. "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess," or by which comes dissoluteness, "but be filled with the Spirit. Speak to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." In the Colossians, ch. iii. 16. it reads—"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; and with all wisdom teach and admonish one another, in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with gratitude in your heart to the Lord." In both epistles these words are preceded and succeeded by exhortations precisely similar, only in a few instances verbally different. Compare

them accurately, and no doubt can exist that the same connexion of things was before the mind of the Apostle in each. Hence it follows, that *to be filled with the Spirit*, and *to have the word of Christ dwelling richly in one*, are of the same import in Paul's mind; and as a means to this end, christians were to abound in singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs.

But this only by the way. You will find a hundred passages to yield to this great principle of interpretation, or rather to this view of the primitive worship and means of edification.

A. Methinks another passage opens to my view: "Stir up the gift which is in you, which was given you according to prophecy by the laying on of the hands of the eldership." Paul's hands were among these, as appears from another passage—"The gift which was given you by the imposing of my hands." Timothy was designated by one of those prophets which had the gift of discerning spirits as a suitable person to act as an Evangelist, and as an agent for Paul in Ephesus. As such he is commanded to *stir up* the gift, not *to quench the Spirit*, but to exercise his gift to edification and comfort.

T. Yes—but this will lead us into another matter; and perhaps it may be a profitable one at some other time: for indeed much of what pertains to the common order which ought to exist in a church, and to the officers which are necessary to its perfection, may be learned incidentally from the gifts of the Holy Spirit of which we are now speaking. But recollect that we are straying off from the subject on which we began.

A. Pardon me. I have been so much engrossed in this view of the ancient worship, that I have forgotten all my questions, and all my thoughts too on the original topic of inquiry.

T. Let us then dismiss the subject for the present, and meet again. You will find it advantageous to read the whole New Testament once through from the 1st chapter of the Acts to the last epistle, with this single idea in your eye; and observe, as you proceed, in what new and clear light it presents many passages to your mind. Recollect the proposition is this: *That the whole worship and edification of the primitive church, in its infancy, was directed by inspired men; and that the Spirit suggested the songs, prayers, exhortations, and, indeed, all the discourses which were useful to the congregation; and that every thing incompatible with these suggestions was reprobated by the Apostles and those judges who had the gift of discerning spirits.* But let me add, excesses and indiscretions occurred then, even among those who possessed the spiritual gifts; and this is no more than might have been expected in that age, by those who best understood the nature of those gifts, for even now, when a perfect and well proved revelation is possessed by us, how often do we err, even in the most common matters, requiring only prudence and discretion!

A. True: But I have not yet satisfied myself upon the topics discussed at our former interview, and will therefore examine all our premises again; and I hope to be able more methodically to lay my difficulties before you at another time.

T. I shall attend to them with all care. Adieu. EDITOR.

TO THE REV. A. CAMPBELL, BETHANY, VIRGINIA.

Sir,

IN your letter, returning my manuscript, intended as a part of my reply to your letters addressed to me in your Millennial Harbinger, there are the following sentences, viz.—"I do this with the assurance that if you present any one contradiction in the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John, fairly made out, I will pay all attention to it. It is unnecessary to do more than exhibit one at a time; for if you can sustain one, we shall admit that you can sustain more."

With this declaration on your part, and the definitions of a few terms on mine, so that we may see the ground on which we act, I will meet you in the Harbinger; and now proceed to point out *one real contradiction in the gospels*, which I understand you to mean by the *testimonies* of the four named Evangelists. I mean a fair discussion—words are to be taken in their usual and obvious import, ambiguities avoided—we will have no distortion of language. Facts are substantives—Truth is a representation of facts, or a fact: deviations from truth are falsehoods. But especially, a *contradiction* consists of an affirmative on one side, and a negative expressed or implied on the other. But affirmative assertions concerning the same subject, which place a fact, or facts, in irreconcileable contrast: so that if one be taken for true, the other must be untrue, *constitute a contradiction*. In plain common sense, every *untruth* includes a contradiction.

We will use the translation called "the King's," as most in use. Nothing in the gospels is to be considered unimportant; while the four books form but one text.

With these preliminaries I enter the field of discussion; and will at once "present," not the first occurring, but one of the simplest contradictions in the Scriptures—from which, nevertheless, important inferences flow, involving the *credit* of the whole Scripture. [See Matthew xxvi. 34.] "Jesus said unto him, [Peter] Verily I say unto thee, that this night before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice." [See Mark xiv. 30.] "And Jesus saith unto him, (Peter) Verily I say unto thee, that this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice." Here the *contradiction* relied on consists in the contrast between once and twice, referring to the crowing of the cock, to say nothing of the entire member thrown into the sentence by Mark, viz. "that this day." Now, sir, each of these holy men give us, as the *very words* of Jesus, a recital variant from one another in *matter of fact;* as *one* is different from two, in meaning and effect, as well as in terms. Both are not true—which is? When, sir, you have digested this—and you want another, you shall have ONE more; reserving to myself the right of reply, within your given rules.

I remain, very respectfully, your humble servant,

HUMPHREY MARSHALL.

July 22, 1831.

LETTERS TO HUMPHREY MARSHAL, Esq.

LETTER VII.

SIR—

I SHOULD have inserted your whole pamphlet, or the whole of the manuscript which you sent me, had either of them been written with so much relevancy, and in terms so inexceptionable as respects taste and moral feeling; or had they been so worthy subjects of criticism as the above communication. This is definite, decent, and *appropos*. It purports to be argumentative, and is so in appearance, if not in reality.

I gave you an invitation to select one of the many contradictions of which you complained; and upon that one we should test the merits of the whole. You have done so. You have made your selection, and if you sustain this, we shall admit, without a trial, that you can sustain others: if you cannot, we must conclude, without trial also, that you cannot sustain any one whatever. This is your Goliah: if he be slain your army is routed, and if he be triumphant we shall strike our tents and retreat without farther ceremony.

"*A contradiction*," as defined in my fifth letter to you, page, 151, and to which no exception has been taken, "*is an irreconcileable contrariety of statement.*" An omission, or a mere variety of statement, or a difference in expression, never can constitute a contradiction; for if that were the fact, all witnesses who do not use all the same words, and in all the same places, are contradictory. Every falsehood is not a contradiction, for then no single affirmative proposition could express a falsehood. Nor is every verbal contradiction a falsehood, as before demonstrated. But "especially, (you say,) a contradiction consists of an affirmative on one side, and a negative expressed or implied on the other." This, though vague enough, is sufficiently relevant to the case before us, because we are speaking of a contradiction between two witnesses. But now on your own definition, and in the case which you have selected: Does Matthew affirm and Mark deny the predicate of the subject. Of Peter, *the subject* of the proposition, it is *predicated* by Matthew that he will, before the cock crow, *thrice deny his Master.* Does Mark deny this of Peter? No: there is no negative expressed or implied on the part of Mark. He does not say that Peter will not deny his Master thrice, nor that he will not deny him thrice before the cock corw once: for, mark it well, his affirming that he will *thrice* deny his Master before the cock crow twice, does neither express nor imply that he will not deny him thrice before the cock crow once! Where now is your affirmative on one side and your negative on the other? *To say it shall be done before the cock crow twice, does not* IMPLY *that it shall not be done before the cock crow once; and most assuredly it does not* EXPRESS *that it shall not be done until the cock crow twice.*

To give it even the semblance of a contradiction it ought to have read in Matthew, 'Before the cock crow once you will thrice deny me;" and in Mark, 'Before, *but not until* the cock crow twice, you shall thrice deny me.' Even then, however, I could demonstrate from other circumstances that there might not be a *real* contradiction, though there would be an *apparent* one; but as it now reads, and upon your own definition, *there is not the semblance of a contradiction.*

But in the event of failing to establish a contradiction here, (which I think you must now see is impossible,) then you will say, 'Whether does Matthew or Mark give the precise words which Jesus spoke.' To this I answer, Not one of the historians pretend to do this. Many of his maxims they quote, and a few of his sayings they publish, but not with a scrupulous or rather a superstitious regard to every letter, pause, and point; but with the most faithful regard to

scope and meaning. This matter is adverted to and descanted upon in my "Hints to Readers" at the end of the Four Testimonies in the New Version. You will see, first edition, page 214, this very point enforced and explained.

But let me more fully illustrate the passage, and show how perfectly groundless is your alleged contradiction. And first, please to notice that in all writers, and as frequently in the New Testament writers as in any others, *there are many general propositions spoken with a limitation not expressed.* Of this sort are the following in the New Testament, comm n version, John v. 31. "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." The Pharisees retorted these words, John xii. 13, "Thou bearest witness of thyself, thy witness is not true." Jesus replies, "Though I bear witness of myself, my witness is true." Again Jesus says, "The testimony of two men is true." These all are general propositions spoken without limitation, and yet every one of them is limited in their application, which is their specified sense: *for the sense of words is not always ascertained from general laws, but from specific applications.* The word "*true*" means *worthy of regard;* for there is no reason can be assigned why the testimony of two men must be true: but the testimony of two was always, according to the Jewish law, worthy of regard. Now there are some cases in which a person's testimony concerning himself is worthy of regard, and there are other cases in which it is not worthy of regard.

Another example, still more in point, is found in John xiii. 33. To the disciples Jesus says, "Whither I go ye cannot come." This is very general, and taken absolutely would teach the disciples that *they could not* follow Jesus. But upon a question proposed a few verses afterwards by Peter, it is limited by the word "*now.*" v. 36. "Thou canst not follow me *now*, but thou shalt follow me afterwards." So that a general proposition which said, "Whither I go ye cannot come," when limited by the circumstances, and explained upon a question made, is equivalent to 'whither I go you cannot come *now.*' Such is the case before us. "*Before the cock crow*" is a general and unlimited expression; but when considered with a reference to circumstances, it is equivalent to "before the cock crow the second time," or "before the cock crow twice."

I am now fairly brought to the explanation of this whole matter, which, had you examined more closely, you would never have selected as a *contradiction*, and still less as *the most palpable one in the book!* The facts in the case are these: The Jews reckoned the day from sun-setting to sun-setting. The night of each day preceded the light. Hence in Greek they called the day *Nuchthemeron.* They divided the night into four watches, of three hours each. The first was from sun-setting till 9 o'clock, called *Hespera.* The second, from 9 till 12, called *Opsia.* The third, from 12 till 3, they called *Proia*; and the fourth, from 3 till 6, or sun-rise, they called *Orthros.* The third watch, called *Proia*, begun and ended by the crowing of the cock. In Judea the day and night being equal all the year, or nearly so, the cock very regularly crowed at 12 and at 3 in the morning. Hence

that watch which began at the first crowing and ended at the second crowing was called *the cockcrowing watch*, or *alektrophonia*.* See Mark xiii. 35. Hence "*before the cock crow*," in allusion to the watches of that night, is equivalent to "*before the cock crow twice*." And the fact proves the prediction and explanation; for before the end of the watch called "*the crowing of the cock*," Peter had thrice denied his Master.

Now, sir, I hope you will be so candid as to admit that neither the words themselves, independent of any allusion to Jewish history, nor the facts in the case, as now explained, according to the reference, Mark xiii. 35, will afford the least semblance of a contradiction. Let us now have a candid and honorable renunciation of your quibbles and *imaginary contradictions*: for if it has thus fared with your Goliah of Gath, where would your Lilliputian army appear!

Your obedient servant,

EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

MR. EDITOR,

A FEW years since, while residing in Wadsworth, Ohio, I was introduced to your Christian Baptist, which was then taken, I think, by the Rev. O. Newcomb, the worthy Pastor of the Baptist church in that place; and I have ever since been an occasional reader of the productions of your pen. Many and various were the opinions, sayings, and surmisings of that day, respecting the probable issue of your exertions; but the orthodox clergy, and many of the laity, seemed to agree in one point, which was, that the editor was a bad man, and that his works ought not to be read. Whatever may have been the primary cause of your exertions, there cannot remain a doubt in the mind of any unprejudiced individual, that generations yet unborn will feel themselves under many obligations to the man, who, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, had the moral courage to stand forth in defence of reason and religion against the attacks of those, who, under the specious veil of friendship, were aiming the most deadly blows at both. For my own part, brought up in the school of orthodoxy, and being thoroughly imbued with her dogmas, I looked upon those from whom they proceeded with a kind of religious veneration; but when the charm was broken, and I beheld the abominable mixture which she held forth to her followers, I dashed the poisoned chalice from my lips, and, perhaps, with it, the water of life. Subsequent to that period, I have read some of your views of christianity, and am almost constrained to say, with one of old, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a christian." There is that sublimity and simplicity in the christian moral precepts, as taught by Jesus, which cannot fail to recommend his ethics to every well regulated mind; and if divested of certain things, which, to me, appear to be extraneous, it could not, it would seem, fail of accomplishing the end designed by that great reformer, the Nazarene. Unfortunate it is, that what I regard as foreign to the system of morality taught by Jesus, is regarded by you as the very essence of that system, and to it altogether indispensable—unfortunate, (I mean, to me,) because I have the misfortune to be found in the minority. But, my dear sir, it is

*Since writing the above I looked into the original Greek of this passage; and the fact is, that in Mark's account, *the cockcrowing* and the second crowing are equivalent; because, in his view, the watch was not complete till the second crowing; therefore, he calls that which precedes it *mesonuktion*, or midnight. The words are, *opse, he mesonuktion he alektrophonias, he proia*—"In the evening, at midnight, cockcrowing, or in the morning."

impossible for me to believe the miracles recorded in the New Testament, or that the laws of nature are, or ever were, in any way deranged on man's account. When I make this declaration I am fully aware of the situation in which it places me; and were it not for a sincere desire to obtain truth, it should have forever remained a secret in my own breast. I do firmly believe the general moral precepts taught by Jesus and his disciples, and hope ever to be found under their guidance; I further agree with you that they were good men, or that they had the good of their species in view in publishing their system to the world. But admitting that they were honest men, does it follow, as you held forth in your debate with Mr. Owen, that they must have told the truth. Perhaps you will contend, from the nature of the facts declared, that this conclusion is inevitable. But when we take into consideration the age in which they lived, the character of the men, and the predilection of mankind in all ages and countries for the marvellous; when we compare these men's doings with those of a similar character of other times and other countries, and view them impartially, it irresistibly brings me to the conclusion that, as to truth and honesty, they generally, if not universally, occupy the same ground. How many honest and well meaning men of the present day do we find believing the most ridiculous and palpable absurdities? and how very easy is it for men to impose upon themselves and others in regard to matters of fact? But I leave this subject, desiring that you will view me as one sincerely desirous of obtaining truth, and ever ready to embrace it when convinced. As a seeker of truth, I desire information; and being unlearned, I would ask of those who possess knowledge. And here I would propose a question: Is an individual culpable for unbelief? Can he believe when he pleases and what he pleases? Can he resist conviction when there is sufficient evidence to produce it? By answering the above you will confer a real favor. I have said that the system taught by Jesus, when compared with other systems, appears to possess a simplicity and beauty for which we may seek in vain in other systems: and I may add, that its influence is doubtless salutary. Would to Heaven that the same could be said of the numerous systems and dogmas of Christians! But, alas! who that is not blind but can see the deleterious effects upon society of the doctrine of "total depravity," held forth to almost every orthodox congregation in christendom, by men who claim to be sent of Heaven. Who can say that it is not lulling men to sleep in the arms of vice, to impress upon their minds a belief that they are totally unable to perform one good action, and that Christ died in man's room and stead? Thus licensing men to sin, and promising him an exemption from the consequences of sinning, through the atonement of Christ. Who cannot discover that orthodoxy is not so much combatting men's vices as their opinions? and that her anathemas are not pronounced against wicked men, but against those who dare to call in question her dogmas?

Now, my dear sir, I wish you all possible success in the work of reformation to which you have set your hands; not because I believe your system to be perfect, but because it is doubtless better than the miserable notions, of Pagan origin, held by most Christians.

Believe me, my dear sir, a sincere seeker for truth, and your friend, not in word, but in heart. H— H—.

Charlestown, Clark Co. Indiana.

REPLY TO MR. H. H.—*No. I.*

Dear Sir,

THE sincerity which appears in your letter before me claims my attention and calls for a few remarks—and but for a few; for on these subjects we have said so much already, that it appears superfluous to add much more.

Jesus Christ, whom you admit to have been an honest and good man and a great teacher, said to some persons who professed to

worship one God, "*If any person be minded to do the will of this one God, he will know whether the instructions I communicate come from that God, or whether I speak them as a mere man.*" This is rather a paraphrase than a translation: but yet this is the scope and meaning of the saying. This saying admitted, precludes the possibility of imagining that there can be an *honest* Deist in the whole race of men where the Bible has come. Honest he may be to his country and to man, but *honest to himself and to God* he cannot be. For who that admits one God, the Maker, Father, and Judge of All, and does not seek with his whole heart to know whether he has ever spoken to man; and if he have spoken, to know what he has said—can be honest to himself and to God? As soon might we admit that he was of sane mind, who, professing to think that his father's will bequeathes to him an immense estate, and hearing that some doubts existed about the certainty or legality of the instrument, never examines the proper documents to ascertain the truth?

But, my dear sir, your case is a peculiar one; not because sectarian creeds frightened you out of your reason and drove you from Babylon past Jerusalem; but because you admit both Jesus and his humble Apostles to have been good and honest men, and yet wilful liars and deceivers of the human race. It is a common argument, but nothing the less powerful, irresistible, and convincing because common, that the authors of the New Testament were either good men or bad men. One of the two they most certainly were. If good men, they could not have deceived men by telling them the thousand lies which they must have told, if they saw and heard not what they affirmed they saw and heard. If we admit them to have been good and honest men, then their testimony must be admitted, because it was impossible for them to be deceived in ten thousand instances, respecting objects of sense too. But if they were bad men, impostors and liars, then they appear in a truly miraculous character: for they conspire to make men good, honest, and virtuous, by commending all goodness and denouncing all vice and villainy, while they themselves hate all goodness and love all vice, and delight in fraud of the most heinous nature! Was such an instance ever known? Wicked men turned reformers of the world, denouncing all iniquity, commending all virtue, piety, and goodness, purely for the sake of blessing men, while they hated both God and men!! Believe this who may, I can never.

Bad men could not be the authors of the New Testament on any principle ever exhibited to man. Good men could not be its authors unless it be true.

You have not, my good sir, attended to one important distinction in my debate with Mr. Owen, between the martyr to an opinion, and the martyr to a fact. The believing in absurd opinions, and the knowledge of sensible objects, are very different matters. When a martyr dies in vindication of his opinions, he only says, *I think it is so.* But when a person dies a martyr to a fact, he says, *I saw, I heard, or I know it is so.*

But you cannot believe in the christian miracles—you *can believe* in ethics. It requires no faith to admit the excellency of mere moral law. Testimony concerning facts calls for our belief: but whether ethics are good or bad is a question tried in the Court of Common Pleas! I thank no man who has two eyes and two ears, for saying that the morals taught by Jesus are the most perfect ever conceived; nay, I can scarcely thank Rousseau for his compliment to the Apostles, in saying they excelled all the sages of all ages in painting historically a perfect character. Often was it attempted, but the greatest wits and philosophers failed as far as Homer, who made his hero invulnerable, save in his heel. They did not do it because they could not. Neither could the Gallilean fishermen, if they had not had the model before them. But they had the model, and they had only to tell the truth—to say what he said, and to tell what he did.

But your greatest difficulty is in admitting *the principle* on which miracles have been performed. Your conceptions of God are such that you cannot think that he cares so much about man as to suspend a law of nature, or to change the course of things on his account. Strange indeed! that God should have done so much for man—made the earth and all its riches for him—gave him dominion over all—and yet should have thought him unworthy of speaking to him, or give him any information of his origin or destiny. Strange indeed! that when he lost the knowledge of his Maker, he would not so much as place his finger on any law of nature to arrest his attention, which would cost him infinitely less labor than for a mechanic to place his finger upon the mainspring or any wheel in a watch, and suspend, quicken, or retard its motion! Strange, I say, that to enlighten man he would not call his attention by some certain proof of his divinity; and yet that there should be in the human breast an expectation of such proofs!

On the hypothesis that God cares so little for man that he would not speak to him, how are we to understand that profusion of goodness which he has bestowed upon him in giving him so exalted a place in the scale of being, and in making every thing, as far as we can know any thing about it, subservient to his use and comfort. And yet, it must be confessed, that there is nothing so essential to the happiness of man as the knowledge of God, and nothing for which, as an intellectual being, he so much pants.

Experience, moreover, proves that if any communication come from God, it must be miraculous, or out of the usual order of things; and if God speak to man at all, miracles are necessary to secure a hearing. He that maintains the impossibility of miracles on any principle, most certainly argues that it is impossible for God, on the same principle to reveal himself to man. Nor are miracles appeals to our ignorance: for they all presuppose such an acquaintance with Nature and her laws as to prevent the possibility of mistake in understanding the character of the power displayed in the miracle. But I am not now to write an essay on the possibility, probability, or certainty of miracles, nor upon the prophecies of the New Testament or

of the Old, which are in the case of the Jews and the present apostate christendom a standing miracle to all who will make themselves acquainted with the Bible and history.* It is only the *principle* from which they proceed to which you allude, and to that I only make a single remark;—that all God's works, and his providence over man, make it reasonable that he would suspend, alter, or control any law of nature for the greatest good of man. It is not so expensive to suspend or control any of the laws of nature for man's use, when it becomes necessary, as it was to create the world, nature, and her laws, for his use.

But to your queries. A man's power to believe is not in himself, but in the testimony. But when the apprehension of the testimony requires an honest mind; and when to such a mind the testimony is competent, unbelief in all such cases is culpable. No man can be innocent who disbelieves the gospel when it is presented to him, for that the evidence is sufficient to all honest and sincere hearted persons, is evident from the fact that millions of all sorts of intellects, from Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, Milton, Young, &c. down to stripplings and those of the weakest mind, have felt all assurance of its truth, even to give them triumph over death in its most terrific forms. The condemnation is just where Jesus said it was, and where it ought to be.—"Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than the light because their deeds were evil." To this Philosophy says, Amen!

Man, however, can neither believe nor disbelieve at his own option, unless he have the evidence; but when the evidence is submitted, if it be not such as to convince him as soon as heard, which is sometimes the case, his belief is always dependent on his will or moral character. "How can you believe who are seeking the honor which comes from man, regardless of that which comes from God?"

I have nothing to do with those dogmas of the metaphysical dreamers of which you complain. But, my dear sir, you must repent and believe the gospel. Morality is only *political* unless it proceed from faith in Jesus. It cannot do more than make a man a good citizen. But what!—are we standing in no relation to God? or are all our relations merely to man and to the material system around us? Think of this, I pray you. God gives you many witnesses of his goodness daily. Know, then, that his goodness is intended to lead you to reformation. Take heed that you despise not this great salvation, and that you do not treasure up wrath against a day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Read the New Testament over and over, until you understand its drift, design, arguments, and motives. If it be true, as it most certainly is, the universe, without the salvation it reveals, is as empty as a blasted nut shell. You are forever undone unless you repent and submit unconditionally to Jesus of Nazareth. It is not merely to submit to his ethics or moral

*If you wish to read a treatise on miracles, I would refer you to Dr. George Campbell's essay on miracles in reply to Hume. If not the best, it is as good an essay as is extant on that subject.

sayings; the state and society will make men moral so far as respects its peace and good order; but you must submit to Jesus as God's Son, as the only Saviour of men, and be guided by him as the only one who can lead you up to the knowledge and enjoyment of God.

There is nothing which he ever spoke or commanded to be spoken that is not most rational, every way worthy of God and worthy of man. The greatest honor which mortal man ever attained, is to have Jesus for his Prophet, Priest, and King; to submit to him in every thing, to be enrolled among his brethren, to be made an heir of God through him, and to acknowledge before men that he is not ashamed nor afraid to surrender himself unconditionally to such an illustrious Chief. It is the first clear and decided proof which any man can give of the soundness of his reason, of the correctness of his mind, to believe the testimony of God, to own Jesus of Nazareth as the Saviour of men, to submit to him as the only Lord of the Universe. Every man who thinks, or pretends to think, that his refusing to give himself up to the guidance of the Messiah, is because he has more reason than others, or because he exercises it better, is as much mistaken as he who thinks to prove himself more rational than others by disputing the existence of God, or by ascribing to blind chance or unintelligent matter the creation of itself or the formation of all the wise designs which the universe unfolds, and which have given to it all the order, beauty, and magnificence which it displays to the eye of reason.—The fear of the Lord, sir, is the beginning of wisdom. And the conclusion of the whole matter is, "*Fear God and keep his commandments:*" for this is the whole reason, honor, and happiness of man.

Very benevolently, EDITOR.

ADVOCATES OF SYSTEM NOT SYSTEMATIC.

EVERY person who commends virtue does not practise it; neither is the advocate of system always systematic. The writer of the following extract, however systematic he may be in some other matters, besides opposing reformation, is not systematic in the acquisition of the knowledge necessary to appreciate the merits of the cause we plead. How little he knows of the cause which he opposes will appear to all the intelligent from the following extract from the Religious Herald of the 22d July:—

"There is something strangely inconsistent, or at least unaccountable, in the course pursued by Bishop Campbell. Having himself reaped the advantages resulting from system, scientifically, morally, religiously and theologically too, if you please, he now turns about to cry down system with all his might. Why! he is like a man who, having attained to a great height in the top of a tree, orders all the limbs to be chopped off; and for what? Is it that no other person may attain to the same elevation? Charity would hope better things; but we can assure him of one thing, and that is, whatever be the design, that will be most assuredly the consequence if he succeed in banishing system out of the world. I have been informed that Mr. C. has taught a school, and perhaps he does now; how does he proceed? Does he erect the beautiful tree of knowledge before the admiring eyes of his pupils, with all its branches and all its foliage, and then bid them make free with its fruits

and grow wise? The veriest tyro in the school, if he were not confounded with the process, would think it a strange mode of teaching. But Mr. C. does not thus teach, either in the school or in the pulpit. In the school he never thinks of it, and in the pulpit he talks of it, but does not practice it. I do not envy the temerity of that man, who, if a dozen brethren get together and compile a short treatise, and call it their articles of faith, will immediately denounce the little harmless thing as a limb of the mother of harlots, while he, at the very time, is consuming his three hours in endeavoring to impress his own peculiar views of the Bible on his auditory; and if his exhibition has not the force of a document printed or not printed, on the minds and memories of those who listen, it is the fault neither of the talent nor disposition of the speaker. Surely, under such circumstances, if modesty were not asleep, she would blush. Having made a hasty excursion to Bethany, we return to the subject, namely, the importance of system. We maintain that there is no effectual progress without it, either in wealth or wisdom. While, with every other person we maintain the importance of system in the things connected with time, we maintain that it is of much greater importance in the things connected with eternity, inasmuch as the one is of infinitely greater importance than the other. We maintain furthermore, that the nature of religious truth calls for system as much as any other truth, whether in morals, the arts and sciences, or the economy of human life. Let it not be supposed that the authority of this sentiment is based on the opinion of an anonymous scribbler, in a periodical. Hear the sentiment of our great and good Mr. Fuller, with that great sublimity and profound perspicuity so peculiarly his own, he asks, Has God formed a system of divinity for us, or has he encouraged us to form one for ourselves? Doubtless the latter. As in the system of nature, things of very different qualities are thrown together in beautiful incoherence and apparent disorder, challenging the industry of man to arrange and classify them under their proper genera and species; so in the system of salvation, God has revealed the great truths of the gospel in such rich abundance and variety, and that not in any systematic form, but in such luscious profusion as not to admit of detail, this part being left to the industry of the student in this noble science; so that now if he wants to believe on any point of doctrine, the variety of proof is not brought together into one place, but he finds them scattered up and down through the divine volume. So with regard to any rule of practice, whether as a candidate for admission into the number of the faithful, or as a member of the church, a parent, a master, a servant. He has to search the scripture in order to find matter to bear on either or all of these points, and if to help his memory he were to arrange the different scriptures under their proper heads, so that he could, at once, find the proper scriptures that supported any particular doctrine or practice, who would blame him—nay, who would not commend him?"

A very little *reading*, and as much *reflection*, would have saved this writer the exposition he has made of himself. A very little *reading*, even without much system, would have informed him that we never said a single word against system in any department of business, literature, morals, politics, or religion. Nor have we ever imagined that there is not a system of both religion and morals taught in the Holy Scriptures. But we are opposed to *human* systems of religious opinions, inferences, or articles of belief; and even to them only when made terms of union or of exclusion. It is true that we contend that God has given us a Divine System, perfect as the system of the universe, and that both Testaments compose that system; but he argues that "*Divine truth is not communicated in the scripture in the best form adapted for its ready reception into the mind.*" He indeed

attempts to sustain this proposition in the article from which the above extract is taken—See Religious Herald p. 105, 4th col. vol iv. We take the affirmative of the above proposition so far as to say that Divine truth *is* communicated in the scripture in the way which God's wisdom and goodness thought best adapted to the salvation of man, and that it never can be bettered by human skill. All experiments made for 2000 years have proved this point, if history prove any thing at all.

But a little *reflection* would have taught him, that if a *human* system must be fashioned out of this *Divine* system, every man must make one for himself; for unless he proves himself infallible, he cannot pretend to bind it on any other than himself. Moreover, he would have learned from a very little reflection or observation, that "this *little harmless thing*" called a short treatise, when bound upon the consciences of men, has been the cause of the shedding of every drop of *Protestant* blood for 2000 years. All who *protested*, both before and since "the Protestant Reformation," have protested against these little harmless calves; for unfortunately, these little pets become bulls, and when their horns grow they gore most ferociously. This gentleman, who calls himself "an anonymous scribbler," need not back his opinions by the great and good Mr. Fuller only: I could give him a Dictionary in folio full of the names of bishops, prelates, cardinals, patriarchs, and popes, who have backed both Mr. Fuller and him in the utility and necessity of these "little harmless things" called short treatises, and "articles of faith," as essential to the salvation of man. I would advise this gentleman to *read* and *reflect* for another year, before he write on matters with which he is so entirely unacquainted. If it be agreeable to him to know, we shall simply inform him, that we have no objection that every disciple in the church universal write out for himself a whole treatise, or a few articles for himself, provided only, that he will neither give to the Sheriff nor to Satan the man who says he cannot perfectly agree with him.

If we dare dissent from so good and great a man as Mr. Fuller, we would say, that his allusion to the earth and its products, with all the toils and labors of man to draw from it the necessaries and comforts of life, is most unhappy, as indicating an analogy between the earth and the Bible. The earth has been cursed for the sin of its inhabitants, and man doomed to toil upon it for his subsistence. Not so was the earth as it came from God. Not so the Bible, God's perfect gift to a fallen world. It has not been cursed to sterility since it came from its Author. It was given to a *fallen* world, and *adapted* to it. His analogy, then, is erroneous; for no such analogy as he supposes exists—consequently, his reasonings from it are fallacious.

But grant the analogy for which he pleads, and what then? God designed to promote man's present comfort by giving him his food and clothing by his own labor, and now he gives him the knowledge of life and salvation in a volume which requires his daily attention; and thus God consults his happiness by making him labor in making him

wise. The analogy is, then, on the fact of its existence, against our friend Fuller and his anonymous admirer. And once more, the analogy is farther yet from aiding him: because man cannot classify in nature the great laws of nature in any way which will effect any change in their operations. They can operate only in the way which they have chosen, or God chose for them. So with the principles of religion, or laws of the moral system. In their present arrangement they operate, but no classification of them can make them operate more beneficially than they do as found in the concrete.

But if Mr. Fuller supposes that we must classify the great principles of religion in order to make them operative, he reasons without any analogy in the case alluded to; for neither the chemist, the philosopher, nor the agriculturist, thinks of giving any new power to nature by any classification of her laws. The understanding may be aided in apprehending them by a rational classification, but their operation continues the same under all circumstances. Hence the wheels of nature moved, and all animals enjoyed health and vigor, in the same measures under the theory of only *four* elements, as they now do under the theory of *forty* elements. So in the moral and religious systems. No creed of five, or of forty articles, has given to man more faith, peace, love, joy, hope, and purity, than the book itself; and indeed it is very questionable whether they have given so much.

EDITOR.

THREE APOLOGIES.

THERE are two things, yea three, for which we owe apologies to our friends and the public. The first is, that we are always behind our dates in issuing our numbers. This has not been so much our faults as our readers may suppose. We have been disappointed sometimes in workmen, sometimes by paper-makers, sometimes by the breaking of our presses, which has lately been a very common incident, and we have had to publish a reprint of the greater part of the Harbinger, vol. 1 to satisfy the loud calls and increasing demands of this enquiring age. Besides, we have had to publish a new edition of our hymn book, and along with all this, we have to travel a little, to labor in the word and teaching, that is, to spend about half the year from home. There are some complaints too, which perhaps ought to be made against the roads and postmasters for retarding the work, and for its failure, sometimes, in reaching its destination. Though we hear as few of these as, perhaps, any other editor in the land; for we see the newspapers and periodicals are frequently and obstreperously complaining of irregularities and failures. We have no reason to complain at all, if all the complaints uttered by other editors are well grounded. The Harbinger is, as far as we know, very courteously treated by the Postmasters generally. But in spite of all that can be done, sometimes packages will break, and papers will take circuitous routes, and other casualties will happen. Concerning the remedying

of this fault, the late issuing of the numbers, we have brighter prospects before us, and hope soon to get up to the beginning of the month.

A second apology is due to our correpondents. We do not answer their letters sometimes at all; and sometimes not for a long time.—This is a grievance to them, and it is to us. But it grieves us more that we cannot promise much reformation of this fault. It is impossible for us to reform a great deal in this matter, unless we were to cease speaking in public, or writing for the press, or refrain from eating, sleeping, &c. To do tolerable justice to our correspondents, would often leave us not an hour in the week. Letters of business are attended to by our clerks, but letters of friendship, or on sentimental subjects, requiring my own attention are frequently postponed until an accumulated pile produces despair, and we are constrained to give up the idea of answering them all. Some of public interest are either formally replied to through the press, and some others are indirectly answered through the same channel. Our apology, in brief, is because it is impossible in reference to other duties of paramount importance. We do not, however, wish our correspondents to be less frequent in their communications; this we would much deprecate. Their letters are of much use to us and the public, though no formal notice should be taken of them. Besides we are solicitous for general purposes to be informed of all matters affecting the cause which we plead, and its success, or the want of success in certain districts. We could wish that our correspondents would, for the sake of others, be more minute and frequent in their details.

An apology is due to all those who complain that we do not visit them. Our reason for not being in every state in the union, and a thousand places on one and the same day, is simply because we have not the power of ubiquity. Nothing prevents us from being in Canada, the Floridas, New Orleans, and Boston on one and the same day, but our not having the power of an angel, or of being omnipresent. I could wish some of our Macedonian criers could here the thousaud entreaties which are coming to us from all quarters for help. A brother in Richmond, Philadelphia, Boston, Montreal, New Brunswick, New Orleans, and I may say every state in the Union, says, there is no place on earth where so much good needs to be done, and so much it seems could be done, as just where I live. Come brother and help us. An old and venerable brother not far from Sacket's Harbor, complained that we had visited some places twice, before we had visited him once. His rule was, that we should never visit any place twice, until we had visited every place once. Suffice it on this subject to say, that we can do no more than we do. Every exertion at home and abroad, which the least possible regard to health and life can justify, is made. Die when we may, we shall not, we trust, have to accuse ourselves of the waste or prodigality of time, or a too great saving of the body or mind, from toil and labor in advocating a cause, which we most conscientiously regard as the cause of God.

It will not be in our power to make any tour out of our own vicinities during this season. Preparing for having the New Translation stereotyped, and other matters connected with the establishment, will oblige us to tarry at our post at home during the ensuing fall and winter.

EDITOR.

UNSEASONABLE AND DANGEROUS PRACTICES.

AFTER a long walk, or laborious exercise, to throw off a coat or outer garment, untie a cravat, expose the neck and breast, and then sit down at an open window or door, in a current of air in the evening.

To drink, after such fatigue or exposure, very cold or iced water.

To eat much fruit, especially in the evening, or to suppose that the evil consequences are to be obviated by a glass of wine, or cordial, or spirit and water.

To eat much animal food, or to drink liquors of any kind, under the idea of thereby removing the weakness caused by the great heat of summer.

To give to infants, or children in general, any such detestable compositions as milk-punch, wine or porter sangaree, or toddy. This practice ought to be an indictable offence at common law.

To give to infants and children any of the various quack medicines, which are recommended as cures for worms, or summer complaints.

To sleep exposed directly to the night air, especially if it be very damp, and much cooler than the air of the day.

To be tempted by the fineness of the evening to sit up till midnight, and, as a consequence, to lie in bed in the morning.

To take the usual meals, when excessively fatigued from want of sleep, unaccustomed labor, or beginning indisposition. Abstinence, or reduced diet, timely commenced, will obviate all the risks from these causes.

Journal of Health.

ERRATUM.

No. 7, p. 330, to complete a question asked, line from bottom 15, after "Judea" read—*be employed in converting the world.*

MONTHLY RECEIPTS

For the Millennial Harbinger.

S E Shepherd, Alba Pa. paid vols 1–2 for E Rockwell, and vol 2 for J C Rockwell and M Wood. J Short, Bedford Ia. vol 2 for W D Scroggan and himself. J Daniel, Saunderson Ky. vol 1 for H Brown, H Childers, and himself. M Green, Elizaville Ky. vol 2. T J Allen, Bricksville O. $1 for vol 2 for A Meech. J Gaskill, New Lisbon O. vol 2 for R P Philips, and $1 for J Cownover. B A Hicks, Lexington, Ky. vol 2 for J P Robinson, A Smith, and B Scott. J Whitaker, Mulberry Tenn. vol 1 for J Watkins, R Russell, and J Frost, and vol 2 for J Whitaker, A G Henderson, T Whitaker, J J White, R Russell, J Watkins, W Moore, and B Whitaker. A B Holleman, Louisville Ala. vol 1. S Morgan, Killbuck O. vol 2. J M Wilks, Florence Ala. vols 1–2 for E Randolph, and vol 2 for G Lipscomb and J W Cope. M Cole, Charlestown, Ia. vol 1 for Margaret Reynolds and P Peyton, and vol 2 for A Wilhoit, J Holman, J Baggs, W W Goodwine, E Baldwin, and J Perisol; also vols 1–2 for M Pane. T J Summer, Huntsville Ala. vol 2. W

Carman, Baltimore Md. paid for 14 subscribers. J Foster, Bedford Ky. vol 1 for J Adams, and vol 2 for J W Taylor, R King, W D Stewart, and W Broad. S Young, Centreville Mi. vol 1 for G Caster. L Page, Russellville Ky. vol 1 for J Smith, and vol 2 for D S Smith, W Gordan, S Wilson, and A Burns. T Wright, Windham O. vol 2. J T Jones, Cincinnati O. vol 2 for R Stout, N Price, and J Vanhawter. J Mendal, Wellsburg Va. vol 1 for R Elston and T Weir, and vol 2 for J Perry, G Armstrong, W Tarr, C Tarr, and himself. G Robinson, Pittsburg Pa. vol 1 for A Bidwell and T P Carothers, and vol 2 for B White, S Snodgrass, and W James; also vols 1–2 for J McCulley, G Brown, and H Smith. N L Lindsay, North Middletown Ky. vol 2 for H T Gorham, E Darnall, J P Brown, B Hollis, and T M Parish. F V Sutton, White Chimnies Va. vol 2 for J Jones, J B Gatewood, J T Sutton, and $1 for vol 1 for J Woolfolk. S Woodruff, New Albany Ia. vol 2 for Elizabeth Spencer, and vols 1–2 for himself. F V Sutton, White Chimnies Va. vols 1–2 for J O Sutton, and vol 2 for R C Sutton, W T Garnett, and J Duval. J W Jeffreys, Jeffrey's Store Va. vol 2 for P Fowlks, and $1 for F Lester, & $1 for A Stokes. N Young, Avon O. vols 1–2. S E Shepherd, Alba Pa. vols 1–2 for D Palmer. J Stuart, Mulloys Tenn. vol 2. A E Baker, Marysville N Y. vol 2 for J Miles, J Anderson, J Lowry, J Allport, A Simmonds, and himself. W Poston, Winchester Ky. vol 2 for H T Chevis, J Morton, H Jacobs, W Webber, L Jones, W Morton, T Bush, T C Gordon, T Faulconer, E Lutrell, O Collins, J Alexander, and vol 1 for J Ashley. T M Henley, Lloyds Va. vol 2 for H B Bartlow, L Smith, and $1 for J Montgomery. F Thompson, Mount Alban Mo. vol 2 for R M Lakeman. J Abbott, Macon Ga. vol 2, and $1 for vol 3. J W Jeffreys, Jeffrey's Store Va. vol 1 and $1 for vol 2 for S Shelbourne, and vol 2 for W A Stone. W D Jourdan, Locust Shades Tenn. vol 2 for J Owesley and M Davis. N Harrit, Greensburg Pa. vol 2 for J McCready, J Moore, and J Taylor. W Jennings, Lancaster Ky. vol 2 for S Smith, H Trupine, and J Robinson; also vols 1–2 for J Woodyard. N Hixon, Maysville Ky. vols 1–2 for J M Holton. L Haggard, Burksville Ky. vol 1 for Beck, and vol 2 for J Tobin. J T Bryan, Owingsville Ky. vol 2 for S Young. J Ficklin, Lexington Ky. vol 2 for B Arnett, W T Bryan, H Foster, M Gist, P Higbee, R Patterson, P Redd, J H Wilson, and vol 1 for J Taylor. J Painter, Columbus O. vol 1. W T Foster, Owentown Ky. vol 2 for S Smith, and vol 1 and $1 for vol 2 for himself. J B Stewart, Royalton O. vol 2. J Lambert, New Canaan Conn. vols 1–2 for H Buckingham and himself. J C Ingram, Wylliesburg Va. vols 1–2 for G W Oliver and T M Roberts, and vol 2 for E A Williams, and J B Ingram. J Fossett, Columbus Ia. vol 2 for J A Crane, H Dickinson, S Nelson, W Robertson, W S Jones, P Troutman, J Gale, J H Vanmeter, J Houser, E Miller, and himself. B Allen, Brownsboro Ky. vol 1 for Catharine Crawford, and vol 2 for P Teater, J Curl, and A H Keller. J Robeson, Madisonville Ky. vol 2 for W Noel, Margaret White, and $1 for himself. J B Radford, Oak Grove Ky. vol 2 for H B Bush, L L Leavel, N Hester, J Moss, and T W Atkinson. A Hicks, Tiptonsfort Ia. vol 2. E Sweat, Lebanon Penn. vol 2 for J Scoby, W Palmer, and himself—and some time since, vol 1 for J Scoby, W Palmer, J Thomas, W Cummings, B Tucker, and himself. D Hook, Louisville Ga. vol 2. A Rice, Mount Sterling Ky. vol 1 for W Chambers, J Hopewood, H Wilson, J Stofer, J Right, J Davis, and E Smith, and vol 2 for J Smith, J Stofer, G M Page, H Wilson, and vol 1 for J Porter. G G Boone, Athens Ky. vol 2 for T Christian, S Shivel, J Davis, O D Winn, H Moore, and himself. T Thompson, Columbia Mo. vols 1–2 for R Roberts and W B Grant, and vol 2 for M Baker, J B Gardon, T P Stephens, and vol 1 for S Maupin. J Hood, West Union Va. vol 2. D Kirkland, St Clairsville O. vol 2.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL—PRICE, $2, IN ADVANCE.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 9. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, SEPTEMBER* 5, 1831. { Vol. II. }

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

From the Christian Messenger.

UNION.

THE question is going the round of society, and is often proposed to us, Why are not you and the Reformed Baptists one people? or, Why are you not united? We have uniformly answered; In spirit we are united, and that no reason existed on our side to prevent the union in form. It is well known to those brethren, and to the world, that we have always, from the beginning, declared our willingness, and desire to be united with the whole family of God on earth, irrespective of the diversity of opinion among them. The Reformed Baptists have received the doctrine taught by us many years ago. For nearly 30 years we have taught that Sectarianism was anti-christian, and that all christians should be united in the one body of Christ—the same they teach. We *then* and ever since, have taught that authoritative creeds and confessions were the strong props of sectarianism, and should be given to the moles and the bats—they teach the same. We have from that time preached the gospel to every creature to whom we had access, and urged them to believe and obey it—that its own evidence was sufficient to produce faith in all that heard it, that the unrenewed sinner must, and could believe it unto justification and salvation—and that through faith the Holy Spirit of promise, and every other promise of the New Covenant, were given. They proclaim the same doctrine. Many years ago some of us preached baptism as a means, in connexion with faith and repentance, for the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit—they preach the same, and extend it farther than we have done. We rejected all names, but Christian—they acknowledge it most proper, but seem to prefer another. We acknowledge a difference of opinion from them on some points. We do not object to their opinions as terms of fellowship between us. But they seriously and honestly object to some of ours as reasons why they cannot unite. These we shall name, and let all duly consider their weight.

Objection 1st: That we have fellowship, and commune with unimmersed persons. They contend, (so we understand them) that according to the New Institution, none but the immersed have their sins remitted; and therefore they cannot commune with the unimmersed. On this point we cannot agree with them, and the reason of our disagreement, is, that this sentiment, in our view, will exclude millions of the fairest characters, for many centuries back, from heaven. For if the immersed only, receive the remission of sins, all those millions that have died, being unimmersed, have died in their sins, or unwashed from their sins. Jesus said, "If ye die in your sins, where God is, you can never come." Of course they are excluded from heaven. Hell, therefore, must be their portion; for Protestants do not believe in a purgatory. Why are they sent to hell? For disobedience to the one command of being immersed. Hear the poor creature's complaint, while suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. On earth, says he, in obedience to the King,

whom I loved, whose laws I loved, whose family I loved, I denied myself, took up my cross and followed him. I was taught that it was my duty to be baptized, and that baptism meant to be sprinkled with water; in the humble spirit of obedience I submitted, not knowing but that this was the very way the King meant this command to be observed. But now, alas! for my ignorance of the right way of performing one command, I must be forever banished from God into everlasting punishment. What should we think of an earthly king, if a province of loving subjects, being ignorant of the meaning of a certain law, and yet endeavoring to obey it according to their understanding of it, should by his order be cut off by an excruciating death? Surely, we should reprobate his conduct, and should see in his character that which is less amiable than otherwise. Is it possible to divest ourselves of the same thoughts and conclusion respecting the lovely King of saints? Should we not, by representing his character in this view, expose it to the contempt of a scoffing world?

I know our brethren say, *We do not declare that they are excluded from heaven, but only from the kingdom on earth. We leave them in the hand of God.* But does not the sentiment lead to that conclusion? We believe, and acknowledge, that Baptism is ordained by the King a means for the remission of sins to penitent believers; but we cannot say, that immersion is the *sine qua non*, without maintaining the awful consequence above, and without contradicting our own experience. We therefore teach the doctrine, believe, repent, and be immersed for the remission of sins; and we endeavor to convince our hearers of its truth; but we exercise patience and forbearance towards such pious persons as cannot be convinced.

2dly. Another cause or reason why we and they are not united as one people, is, that we have taken different names. They acknowledge the name *Christian* most appropriate; but because they think this name is disgraced by us who wear it, and that to it may be attached the idea of Unitarian or Trinitarian, they reject it, and have taken the older name, *Disciple*. This they have done in order to be distinguished from us. Hence it is concluded that they wish to be a party distinguished from us, and have therefore assumed this name as a party name. This at once bars us from union in the same body, and we cannot but believe it was assumed for this purpose, by some. We should rejoice to believe the contrary. Until a satisfactory explanation be given on this subject, we must view ourselves equally excluded from union with the congregation of the Disciples, as from any other sectarian establishment. We object not to the scriptural name, Disciple, but to the reasons why our brethren assumed it.

We are ready any moment to meet and unite with those brethren, or any others, who believe in, and obey the Saviour according to their best understanding of his will, on the Bible, but not on opinions of its truth. We cannot with our present views unite on the opinion that unimmersed persons cannot receive the remission of sins, and therefore should be excluded from our fellowship and communion on earth. We cannot conscientiously give up the name *Christian*, acknowledged by our brethren most appropriate, for any other (as *Disciple*) less appropriate, and received to avoid the disgrace of being suspected to be a Unitarian or Trinitarian. We cannot thus temporize with divine truth.

We have frequently, and for more than a quarter of a century, contended for the name *Christian*, as that given by divine authority, and designed to supersede all other names of the Lord's followers. We are sorry that the New Translation, purporting to give us that of Dr. Doddridge on the Acts of the Apostles, has rejected his, and given us another of Acts xi. 26. Dr. Doddridge's translation is "And the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch." If this be a correct translation, then the matter is forever put to rest, that the will of God is, that the older name *Disciple* should cease, and the new name *Christian* should forever after take place of it. To reject the name *Christian* for any other is to act in opposition to the

will of God; so it appears to us. Doddridge in justification of his translation, observes in a note, "I think with Dr. Benson, that the use of the word *Chrematisai* (*named*) implies that it *was done by a divine direction*. As proof he refers us to Matt. ii. 12, 22. Luke ii. 26. Acts x. 22. Heb. viii. 5–11; vii. 12, 25, where the same word is used. Let us examine every passage in the New Testament where the word *Chrematizo* (*was called*) occurs; and, I think, that the translation, *were named by divine appointment*, will be found correct and true. In Matt. ii. 12, 22, the word is translated, "*being warned of God*"—or divinely warned. In Luke ii. 26, the word is translated, *It was revealed* to him by the Holy Ghost. In Acts x. 22, the word is translated, Cornelius "*was warned of God* by a holy angel to send for thee." In Heb. viii. 5, it is translated "Moses *was admonished of God*." Heb. xi. 7, it is rendered, "By faith Noah *being warned of God*." In Heb. xii. 25, "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him *that spake* on earth"—the word *spake* is translated from the same word *Chrematizo*, and should, according to the translations above, be rendered, refuse not him that *divinely spake, admonished* or *warned* on earth. It is too plain to deny, that Moses spake by divine authority, and therefore his warnings and admonitions were divine oracles. The same word occurs Rom. viii. 3, "So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she *shall be called* an adulteress;" that is, she *shall be called by divine authority* an adulteress. This is the natural meaning, from which none can dissent.

Dr. A. Clark, on the text, (Acts xi. 26) is of the same opinion with Dr. Doddridge with respect to the meaning of *Chrematizo;* he says, it signifies, in the New Testament, to *appoint, warn*, or *nominate* by *divine direction*. The learned Doctor adds, "A *Christian*, therefore, is the highest character which any human being can bear on earth; and to receive it from God, as those appear to have done, how glorious the title!"

To confirm this meaning of the word *Chrematizo*, I will add a few extracts from Josephus, a classic Greek writer. They are cited by Dr. Parkhurst on the word. "Moses *Echrematizeto*, was *instructed* by God in what he desired." "Josephus calling an *oracular dream* of *Jaddus* the Highpriest's, *to Chrematisthen*, what *was divinely communicated* to him." I think I have referred to every passage of the New Testament where the word occurs, and it is now left with the public to determine whether Dr. Doddridge's translation be not correct, i. e. that the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch.

This translation of Doddridge fully comports with the prophecy of Isaiah, lxii. 2. "And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Again, lxv. 15. the Prophet speaking of the fall, rejection, and overthrow of the Lord's people, the Jews, says, "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." This *new name* the ancient fathers believed was *Christian*. Eusebius thus speaks of the first converts of christianity: "It is most certain, when as the coming of our Saviour Christ was now fresh in the minds of all men, that a new nation, neither small nor weak, neither such as was conversant and situate in corners of fountains and well-springs, but of all other most populous and most religious, secure as touching danger, and of invincible mind, aided continually by the divine power of God, at certain secret seasons, suddenly appeared; the same, I say, being beautified among all men by the *title and name of Christ:* the which one of the Prophets foreseeing to come to pass, with the single eye of the Divine Spirit, being astonished, spake thus: Who hath heard such things! or who hath spoken after this manner! Hath the earth travailing brought forth in one day! Hath any nation sprung up suddenly and at one time! In another place he hath also signified the same to come to pass, where he saith, They that serve me shall be called after a new name, which shall be blessed on earth. Isaiah 65 and 62. Although presently we plainly appear to be upstarts, and this name of *Christians* of late to have been notified unto all nations," &c. Lib. 1. ch. 5.

In this same chapter Eusebius goes on to show that the saints of old, as Noah, Abraham, and others, were Christians *in deed*, though not *in name*, and quotes as proof the 105th psalm—"See that ye touch not my Christs, (that is, anointed,) neither deal perversely with my Prophets." This name *Christian* was the new name given by the Lord to his people, according to the early fathers, and by which they were called.

It was the name by which the disciples of Christ were peculiarly distinguished after they were called so at Antioch. Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Acts xxvi. 28. Peter said, "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." Peter iv. 15. The Lord commends the church in Pergamos, that "thou holdest fast my name," and the church in Philadelphia, "Thou hast not denied my name." Against the name *Christian* persecution raged, and thousands suffered martyrdom for it. Had they denied the name, their lives would not have been taken. It is an old argument, yet its antiquity does not make it weak, that as the woman takes the name of her husband—so the bride, the church, should properly be called by that of her husband, Christ. It is believed there are none who deny that *Christian* is the most appropriate name for the followers of Christ, though many prefer others for various reasons. It is the name which must and will supersede all other denominations, and be a means of uniting the scattered flock.

Our brethren, the Disciples, ask us, How can you grant the privileges of the kingdom to such as have not been immersed, when it is plain that by immersion only they are born or made members of the kingdom? How can you commune with such at the Lord's table? I answer, that there are many things done under the New Institution or Covenant which were divinely instituted before that Covenant was fully confirmed and declared; yet these things were designed to be perpetuated to the end of time. Thus prayer, praise, thanksgiving, teaching, preaching, and even the Lord's supper, were divinely instituted before Jesus died, was buried, and rose again; consequently, before the foundation of the New Institution was fully laid, and, of course, before any were built upon it. John's baptism brought none into the new kingdom. The disciples, and the rest of the 120 on Pentecost, were therefore not inducted into this new kingdom by immersion; yet they prayed, praised, and communed with those in it, and these divine acts were reciprocated. As well might we forbid unimmersed persons to pray, to praise, to teach, as to forbid them to commune. These privileges were enjoyed before the kingdon was established and before the New Institution took place, and we dare not say they are now taken from them! It was not done at Pentecost. It has not been divinely done at any period since. What authority have we for inviting or debarring any pious, holy believer from the Lord's table? Though it is done by many, we see no divine authority for it. The King's will is, that his friends do this in remembrance of him—and all that his law expressed on the subject, is, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat and drink." If he eat and drink unworthily, he eats and drinks damnation to himself, [not to others,] not discerning the Lord's body. He has no where established a court of inquisition to fence his table, nor to prevent any from praying, praising, or worshipping him unless they have been immersed. We confess we cannot see why so much more importance should be attached to the Lord's supper, than to the other divine commands. We have long feared that the feast of love has been made by designing men an occasion of discord and division among the saints. We have seen many unimmersed possess the spirit of the kingdom; and we have seen many immersed destitute of it. To receive the latter, and to reject the former, we cannot view divine.

If we philosophize on religion, we may amuse the intelligent, but are unprofitable to all. Nothing but truth– truth felt, truth preached in the spirit, and truth copied in our lives, will arrest the attention, and gain and fix the heart of a drowsy, dying world.

I have long thought, and seriously thought, whether a formal union on the Bible, without possessing the spirit of that book, would be a blessing or a curse to society—whether it would be better than faith without works, or than a body without the spirit—whether it would not rather be a stumbling block, a delusive snare to the world. O, my brethren! let us repent and do our first works—let us seek for more holiness, rather than trouble ourselves and others with schemes and plans of union. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us, will more effectually unite than all the wisdom of the world combined. Endeavor to walk in peace and love with all. Then shall we feel a reviving from the presence of the Lord, and see flowing to the Lord, weeping penitents, pleading for mercy, and praising aloud for mercy received through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

REPLY ON UNION, COMMUNION, AND THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

IN speaking or writing on this subject of *Union*, more than on most others, we deceive ourselves and one another, without knowing or intending it. The want of precision in the meaning attached to our terms may be the cause of this. It might appear hypercritical, or perhaps something worse, to ask the worthy editor of the Christian Messenger what he means by "*union in form?*" Does he mean a formal confederation of all preachers and people called "*Christians*," with all those whom he calls *Reformed* Baptists? (rather *reforming* than *reformed*;) or (as he represents them as prefering for a *sectarian* purpose the name) disciples. If so, what shall be the articles of confederation, and in what *form* shall they be ministered or adopted? Shall it be in one general convention of messengers from all the societies of "christians" and "disciples," or one general assembly of the whole aggregate of both people? Shall the articles of agreement be drawn up in writing like the articles of the "General Union" amongst the different sects of Baptists in Kentucky?

Has there been such an incident in ecclesiastical history of a whole people formally and in good faith uniting with another whole people without such a formal confederation? Or does he expect a "union in form" without any form of effecting it? If he do not, then it is out of order to complain of the want of a formal union until a proposition made to that effect shall have been submitted by the complainant, and rejected by the defendant. But such a proposition has not, as we have heard, been tendered; nor have we heard of any general meeting among the Christians to deliberate upon the terms and conditions. Or does he think that one or two individuals, of and from themselves, should propose and effect a formal union among the hundreds of congregations scattered over this continent, called christians or disciples, without calling upon the different congregations to express an opinion or a wish upon the subject?

It is, too, a question with some weak consciences, whether there can, in spirit and in truth, under Jesus Christ, in existing circumstances, be such a thing as some might denominate a wholesale union between two whole societies as such. Men, we know, grouped in whole states, can confederate for political purposes; but it is for tem

poral and temporary objects, in which other principles are supreme than those refined sensibilities springing from faith in Jesus and love to the saints, which constitute, if not the bond, the concentrating principle of union, among the faithful followers of Jesus Christ. These are questions which we only propose without a discussion or an answer. We solicit the most definitive view of brother Stone on these topics.

We discover, or think we discover, a squinting at some sort of precedency or priority in the claims of the writer of the above article, which are perhaps only in appearance, and not in reality; but if in appearance only, he will prevent us or or any reader from concluding unfavorably by explaining himself more in detail than he has done. He says, "The reformed Baptists have received the doctrine taught by us many years ago." "For nearly thirty years ago we taught," &c. &c. From what source or principle these sayings proceeded, we do not pronounce sentence; but if they are mere words of course, and he intended to plead nothing from them, we would suggest the propriety of qualifying them in such a way as to prevent mistake.

I am, as at present advised, far from thinking that the present advocates of reformation are only pleading, or at all pleading, for what was plead in Kentucky thirty years ago, after the dissolution of the Springfield Presbytery. If such be the conceptions of brother Stone, I am greatly mistaken. That he, with others, did at that time oppose authoritative creeds, and some articles in them as terms of communion, and some other abuses, we are not uninformed; but so did some others who set out with him. And as he would not consider them as now pleading the cause which he now pleads, so we cannot think that the cause which we plead was plead either by him or any one else *twenty* years ago. Many persons both in Europe and America, have inveighed against sects, creeds, confessions, councils, and human dogmas, during the last two centuries, and some even before Luther's time; but what have these to do with the present proposed reformation? That is only the work of a pioneer: it is clearing the forests, girdling the trees, and burning the brush.

I am not ashamed to own that the greatest heretics in christendom have inveighed against creeds, councils, and human dogmas. And every man who has been persecuted rightfully or wrongfully, has denounced the creed and the council which decreed him to the stake. Our opponents tell us of all this; and if Satan, even Satan tell the truth, he ought to be believed. But this admitted neither makes their cause who oppose us the better, nor ours the worse.

Both friends and foes of the cause which we now plead, seem to be agreed that not the anti-creed, and anti-council, and anti-sectarian questions, but what may be denominated the questions of "the ancient gospel and ancient order of things," distinguish it most easily from every other cause plead on this continent or in Europe since the great apostacy. Not, indeed, because it has not some things in common with other causes; but because when all the common things are taken into the account, it presents what some of our opponents call a new

religion—an exhibit of christianity as different from the sectarian as Protestantism differs from Popery; and if I were to give my opinion, I would say, much more different.

I trust our brother Editor will not think that we are merely disputing his claims to priority, as it is not assumed by us that he has set up such a claim; but only that in appearance it squints that way: but that he will consider us as endeavoring to prevent the confounding of the *ancient gospel* and *ancient order of things* with the anti-creed, or anti-council, or anti-sectarian cause. Sorry would I be to think that any would be so indiscriminating as to identify the principles of this reformation with the principles of any other reformation preached since Luther was born.

Catholics oppose sects as much as the Editors of the Messenger and Harbinger. Methodists oppose hypercalvinism as much as either of us; and all heretics oppose authoritative creeds which condemn their opinions. So far I am a Catholic, a Methodist, and a heretic. But many great and good men have opposed these evils as much as either Catholics, Methodists, or heretics.

Our eagle-eyed opponents plainly see the difference between the radical and differential attributes of this reformation, which they ignorantly call a deformation, and any other cause, however unpopular, plead in the land. "The Christians" in some places, nay, in many places, are quite respectable in the eyes of those who contemn "the disciples" as unfit for good society. And I think the amiable editor of the Christian Messenger himself told me last winter, that even he and some of his brethren were considered by the orthodox as degrading themselves because they associated with us most "unworthy disciples." Indeed, it was no mean proof of his christian spirit to see him so condescending to persons of such low degree in the estimation of the noble christians of the land. His willingness to fraternize with us in despite of the *odium theologicum* attached to our ancient gospel, I must ever regard as an additional proof of his unfeigned regard to the authority of Jesus as Lord, and his love to all them who esteem the reproach of the Messiah greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt.

For our part, we might be honored much by a union formal and public, with a society so large and so respectable as the Christian denomination; but if our union with them, though so advantageous to us, would merge "the ancient gospel and ancient order of things" in the long vexed question of simple anti-trinitarianism, anti-creedism, or anti-sectarianism, I should be ashamed of myself in the presence of him whose "*well done, good and faithful servant,*" is worth the universe to me. We all could have had honorable alliances with honorable sectaries, many years since, had this been our object.

These remarks have all grown out of the seeming identification of the cause we plead with that plead in Kentucky some 25 or 30 years ago. Had not these appeared in the preceding article, there would have been no occasion for saying a word on this subject.

Our good brother *Stone* has not been himself when he wrote the

above article, as we are not ourselves when we read it. He says, "We do not object to *their opinions* as terms of fellowship between us; but they seriously and honestly object to some of *ours*." This fails not in christian courtesy to our *honesty* and *sincerity;* but in argument it fails: for when he proceeds to state his *opinions*, which are supposed to be our *reasons* why we cannot unite in form with them, these *reasons* and *opinions* are comprehended in a *unit*, and that happens to be not an *opinion*, but a *practice*. It is called "Objection 1st." (but I cannot find the 2d.) and reads in the following words:—"*That we have fellowship and commune with unimmersed persons.*"

This is the only objection which is alleged in the whole article as lying in the way of our uniting with them. It is, then, the *practice* of setting aside a divine institution, not in the judgment of the person received, but in the judgment of those who receive him.

It was not through design, but I think through oversight, that our worthy brother then turns the attention of his reader from this *practice* to the meaning of baptism for remission of sins: for it is not because of our views of the meaning of immersion, (in which he seems to agree with us,) but because the "Christians" now make immersion of non-effect by receiving persons into the kingdom of Jesus, so called, irrespective of their being legitimately born; or, in brief, regardless of the command, "*Be baptized every one of you.*"

Thus he loses sight of our objection altogether; and we find him lamenting the fate of some poor Paidobaptist, not in Hades, not in Purgatory; but, as he says, literally and truly in Hell, praying for himself because he had simply mistaken his road.

The words which our brother Stone has put into the mouth of this mistaken Paidobaptist, suffering the vengeance of an eternal fire, are not exactly in point. It was, indeed, kind to make this imaginary Paido tell as good a story of himself as possible: "In the humble spirit of obedience I submitted to be sprinkled." But I do not know how this Paidobaptist could, even in torment, so far forget himself as to say that "in the humble spirit of obedience he submitted to be sprinkled," when in fact he was, when a crying babe, sprinkled in his father's arms. And to be in point, such must have been the fact; *for it is not fair to take any other than a common case to sustain a common practice.*

But in this whole case there is an entire mistake of the whole question. It assumes a principle inadmissible, viz. That God's rule or principle of rewarding men hereafter, is to be, as near as we can guess at it, the rule of our conduct to them in receiving them into his kingdom on earth, and in treating them as members of it. I will undertake, without fee or reward, to plead the cause of every soul in torment, and guaranty his release, or prevent his condemnation to it, on the principles embraced in the prayer of this unfortunate Paidobaptist. Every sincere Mussulman, Pagan, Infidel, Jew, Deist, Atheist, under Heaven, may convert Hell into a Purgatory, if you will give validity and prevalence to this plea. And as for the *insincere*, we shall find for them a good plea of another sort. But the question

is, Are we authorized to make the sincerity and honesty of a person's mind a rule of our conduct? 'Tis God alone who is judge of this, and surely he would not require us to act by a rule which we can never apply to the case. Neither, perhaps, is it a fair position to assume that any man's sincerity in opinion or belief will have any weight in the final judgment; but whether or not, it cannot be a rule of our proceeding in any case. We judge from actions—God judges the heart; and, therefore, we look for visible obedience; and when we are assured that the Lord has commanded every man to confess him, or to profess the faith and be immersed into his name, we can never justify ourselves before God or man in presuming in our "judgment of charity" to set aside his commandment, and in accepting for it a human substitute.

We do not recollect that we have ever argued out the merits of this "free and open communion system." But one remark we must offer in passing, that we must regard it as one of the weakest and most vulnerable causes ever plead; and that the "*great*" Mr. Hall, as he is called, has, in his defence of the practice, made it appear worse than before. In attempting to make it reasonable, he has only proved how unreasonable and unscriptural it is.

But of the following sentence we complain:—"We cannot, with our present views, unite on the opinion that unimmersed persons cannot receive the remission of sins." This is not the question at all. And long before a word was said about baptism for remission, our friend plead for dispensing with it, because, in his judgment, it ought to be no term of communion. But we shall dismiss this topic, and when our friend Stone shall think good to reconsider his remarks, we shall more *in extenso* exhibit the true merits of this objection.

An attempt is made by our friend to draw out of a remark on the appropriation of the name Christian, vol. 1, p. 373, a second objection urged by the friends of reform against union with the Christians. But I must confess I never heard that any advocate of the ancient gospel asked any person to give up the name "*Christian*" and to substitute for it the name *Disciple*. Yet he says, "We cannot conscientiously give up the name "Christian," acknowledged by our brethren most appropriate, for any other (as *disciple*) less appropriate, and received (assumed) to avoid the disgrace of being suspected to be a Unitarian or Trinitarian. We cannot thus temporize with divine truth." Well, brother Stone, do not *temporize* with divine ordinances by substituting sincere sprinkling for sincere obedience, or for immersion. But, really, I confess ignorance on the whole subject of this requisition to abandon the name Christian. I only wish, for my part, that we were worthy of it. It is easy to assume a good name, but how hard to deserve it! I am not prepared, either, to say *Amen* to all the criticism offered to prove that we must, by *divine authority*, be called Christians, whether we deserve it or not.

The controversy about the name by which we shall be called, is, and must necessarily be, one of subordinate importance. We could not in good conscience substitute the *opinion* of Dr. Doddridge for the

literal import of the word (*chrematizo.*) We must always in interpreting distinguish between the *opinion* of a translator and the *meaning* of the word. Every body knows that there are no words in the Greek corresponding to "*divine appointment.*" And if ever *chrematizo* signifies to name or call by divine authority, it is most certainly from accident or from circumstances, and not from the import of the term: *for it means no such thing.* The root of the word is *chrema,* business; and because it was usual to designate or name persons from their business, as Smith, Taylor, Baker, Clark, &c. so the word *chrematizo,* formed from *chrema,* came actively to signify, to name, or to call, and passively to be named or called.

When brother Stone was quoting the 4th meaning of the word from Parkhurst, it would have been well for him to have let his readers know the mind of this same Mr. Parkhurst. He says, "Wetstein on Rom. vii. 3. has abundantly proved that the verb frequently signifies in the Greek writers to be *named* or *called.* But Doddridge thinks that *chrematisai,* Acts ii. 26. denotes to be named by divine appointment or direction. *I cannot, however, find that the verb ever has this signification.* The passages of scripture to which the Doctor refers in proof of his interpretation, *do by no means come up to his point.*" With this opinion of Parkhurst I do most sincerely concur, and when it becomes necessary I will go into the details.

Our worthy friend has been too precipitate also in quoting Adam Clarke on this passage. Adam Clarke begins the section from which he quotes with an *if*—"*If,* therefore, the name was given by divine appointment." He enters not decisively into the matter.

That the word sometimes signifies to warn, admonish, or appoint, whether by God, angels, or men, is abundantly evident, and occurs sometimes in this acceptation in the New Testament. In this we agree with Adam Clarke. But with Dr. Campbell we agree that *chrematizo* does not necessarily imply *from God* more than the word *warning* does. This is evident from the reference which, both in sacred authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. He condemns Dr. Doddridge's version of Acts ii. 26. (See his note on Math. ii. 12.) I am bold to affirm, in the face of all criticism, that there is not the least authority, *in the word here used,* for concluding that the name *Christian* came from God, any more than from Antiochus Epiphanes! This may be too strong for some who contend that the *name* Christian is of divine authority; but let them put me to the proof.

That it was given neither by dream, oracle, angel, nor apostle, is, in my judgment, by far the more probable opinion. If it had been given by the authority of the Lord it would not have been delayed for *ten years* after the day of Pentecost, nor reserved for the city of Antioch to be the place of its origin. 'The *disciples* were first named *Christians* in Antioch, A. D. 43.' But some person may say that the disciples had not become Christians till 43, and that the conferring of the name at Antioch was because it was the first time the *disciples* deserved it. It is true the term *disciple* is a much more *humble* name

than the name Christian, and that persons may be found worthy of the name *disciple*, who are not worthy of the name Christian. To be a Christian is to be a follower of Jesus Christ, and a disciple is a learner, a scholar. One who wishes to be a *Christian* may be called a *disciple;* but every disciple of Plato, Pythagoras, or Christ, is not worthy to be called a Platonist, a Pythagorean, nor a Christian. But there is a loose, as well as a strict use of words; and there is a national and sectarian, as well as a literal and philological usage of them. Hence every citizen of the United States is a Christian in Algiers, in India, or Japan. But not to lose sight of the subject before us; with us it is a strong argument, that had the disciples been first called Christians by *divine appointment* at Antioch, then the Apostles would, from that time forth, have addressed the disciples by this divinely appointed name. But this they did not so much as *once* in any public document which has come down to us. The Antiochians called the disciples first Christians; Agrippa used the term once in reference to himself; and Peter said, that if any man was endited as a Christian, or, "if any man suffered as a Christian, let him not be *ashamed*;" which argues that it was under this name their enemies persecuted and traduced them. But no document has come down to us authorizing us to think that this name Christian was regarded by any of the Apostles as of divine appointment.

If Paul, in any of his letters—if Peter, James, or John, had only once said, "To the *Christians* in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Greece, Asia, Judea," or any where else; then, indeed, there might have been some ground to think that they regarded it as of divine appointment! And recollect it was 50 years and more from the time they were first called Christians, before all the New Testament was written. They are called disciples, saints, believers, the called, sanctified, in the Acts and in the Epistles; but never once addressed under the name Christians.

Now let it be remembered, that we have no objection to the name Christian if we only deserve it; nor predilection for the name *disciple*, except for its antiquity and modesty: but when it is plead for as of divine authority, and as the only or most fitting name which can be adopted, we must lift up our voice against the imposition, and contend for our liberty, where the Lord has left us free. Would to God that all professors could be addressed as saints, faithful brethren, disciples indeed, christians.

Our brother of the Messenger has called for these remarks, which are offered in the same candor in which he appears always to write. We have very high respect for him and the brethren who are with him. Many of them with whom we are acquainted we love as brethren; and we can, in all good conscience, unite with them in spirit and form, in public or in private, in all acts of social worship.

We do not conceive that we have adverted to every thing in the preceding article worthy of our attention. We have reserved some items for another occasion; but the chief points are noticed directly or indirectly in the preceding observations. We should like to have

a very free, familiar, and affectionate correspondence with brother Stone on these subjects which he has introduced through the medium of the press. As I have copied his communication into these pages, I doubt not but he will copy these remarks in reply into his. And indeed I think the question of union and co-operation is one which deserves the attention of all them who believe the ancient gospel and desire to see the ancient order of things restored.

EDITOR.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.—*Part 3d.*

AUSTIN AND TIMOTHY.

Austin. Since we last separated I have overcome a difficulty which at our first interview I thought insurmountable.

Timothy. And, pray, what is it?

A. It is, that besides what is written in the book, *there can be no new light communicated to the mind, no new arguments offered to convert men to God.*

T. And to this you should add, *that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine word.*

A. This I might add, were I fully persuaded that light alone constitutes all converting power. But of this I am not yet fully convinced.

T. I think we agreed, in our first interview, that moral light is contained in words; and, therefore, where there are no words there can be no light.

A. On reflecting on that saying, I have since suspected its truth, because deaf and dumb persons have some light, some moral light, I mean, on some subjects; and if all moral light were contained in words, how could they have any light, never having heard a word?

T. But signs of any sort, which represent ideas, are comprehended in our acceptation of *words*. Words, it is true, are signs of our ideas; but not the only signs. Actions are also signs of ideas. Actions presented to the eye are equivalent to words addressed to the ear. But without actions, or rather without stipulated signs, i. e. signs agreed upon, there can be no idea communicated to the human mind, and therefore all moral light, or all truth, is received by signs. And as the stipulated signs of ideas with us are words, it is in no sense improper to say, that all the moral light which we enjoy is received by words, or, if you please, to be hypercritical, by signs equivalent to words.

A. Grant it, and then it follows that light is but a figurative name for truth.

T. It is, in all languages, a metaphor. Light stands for knowledge, and knowledge is an acquaintance with truth. A man of knowledge, and an enlightened man, are equivalent designations. "Once you were darkness, but now are you light in the Lord," is a saying which will remind you of a hundred others in the sacred style to this effect.

A. Let it be admitted then; for I see nothing to be gained by the exception which I have taken, nor by an over squeamishness about words. I accede to the proposition *that all moral light or moral truth is contained in words, or represented by them.* But still the question recurs, Is light all that is necessary to convert men?

T. The question is equivalent to—Is truth all that is necessary to convert men? To answer this with a *yes* or a *no* might subject us to misapprehension, and consequently to misrepresentation, and therefore we must qualify our answer to this question. There is something in the New Testament called *the truth*, *the light*, to give it emphasis and to distinguish it from all other truth. "You shall know *the truth*, and *the truth* shall make you free." This is a eulogy on *the truth* pronounced by Him who called himself "*the Truth and the Life.*" There are many truths which cannot convert men, for they have no moral power; but there is *the truth* which has all moral power, and that is the truth which makes men free. "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is the truth," said the Saviour. All the moral power of God or of man is exhibited in the truth which they propose. Therefore we may say that if the light or the truth contain all the moral power of God, then the truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men, for we have before agreed and proved that the converting power is moral power.

A. But I think you first introduced this proposition to show that the Spirit could exert no more power in converting men, and could give them no more light, than what is contained in the written word, provided the written word contains all the light or revelation that is necessary to salvation.

T. For this purpose this proposition was submitted. To illustrate it I would call to my aid a similitude; but, indeed, neither ancient or modern history, observation nor experience, furnishes us with a worthy similitude. Suppose, however, that the subjects of some prince had revolted from his government, their own crimes inducing them to suppose that he had become their irreconcileable enemy. They seek to dethrone him because, in consequence of their ingratitude and acts of rebellion, they infer that he is incensed against them. He, by calling on other provinces, might crush them by physical power, but chooses rather to reconcile them to himself, and convert them from enemies to friends. He loads them with innumerable favors, sends dignified messengers to declare his merciful dispositions, sustaining their representations by appeals to his generosity, and the multiplied instances of his bounty which they continually enjoy. After remonstrating in vain, he permits them to wreak their vengeance on his only Son, whom he delivers up to their will in proof of his benevolence. After this he has nothing to propose except forgiveness for all their acts of cruelty and rebellion, and a restoration to his favor and friendship on condition of their submission and return to their duty. He can do no more. This is the sum total of his moral power. Their destruction or his dethronement is the only alternative; other arguments he has not to offer. These slighted, and

mediation is at an end. Now when all this is stated and proved, nothing can be added by any new messenger or mission. This scheme is both the wisdom and the power of the prince to the reconciliation of every one who receives it. It is his whole wisdom and his whole power to effect a reconciliation. He who rejects it, must dethrone the prince or be destroyed.

We have only alluded to the outlines of the arguments. They may be developed and placed in various lights before the minds of those addressed; but yet, when all is fairly told and fully presented, no new light, truth, argument, or power, can be exhibited.

A. This I perceive; but yet there is a difficulty in my way. To remember the similitude you have brought, this is a matter of report or of testimony to most of his subjects. Such also is the fact with regard to all the living as respects the things reported by the Apostles. It comes by faith, or our assurance depends upon testimony which we cannot believe of ourselves without some assistance. Now this is still the great question.

T. Assistance to believe! This is a metaphysical dream. How can a person be assisted to believe? What sort of help? and how much is wanting? Assistance to believe must be either to create in a man a power which he had not before, or to repair a broken power. You do not think of this. Will you explain what you mean by assistance to believe!

A. I do not mean creating a new power of believing, because men can believe the truth when told them by men, but we must be made to feel our need of a Saviour before we will seek an interest in him, and before we believe in him.

T. It is by faith we discover our need of a Saviour; for if we did not first believe the testimony of God, we could not know that we had sinned against God. So that faith in the testimony must precede all conviction, repentance, reformation; all sorrow, all feeling of every sort. That which makes men feel, love, fear, tremble or rejoice, is in the testimony; and without faith in the testimony, nothing which it contains can move us more than that which we never saw nor heard. *Without faith in the Divine testimony, it is impossible that any thing in that testimony can move us*—So that faith precedes all feeling. Now if a person can believe one part of the Divine testimony without new power, or without new faculties, or without any aid, he can believe another part of it, for it is all alike credible or incredible.

A. Well: something must be first, I admit; and I suppose faith had as well stand first—but whatever comes first, we must be aided in doing that. We all want most help when we are beginning any thing. All that I plead is a little help at first.

T. Is the help to be within us, or without us?

A. Within us. The Holy Spirit makes the word more powerful, or increases our strength to receive it,

T. If it make it more powerful, it must be by revealing some more powerful ideas, not in it; by adding to it some corroborative arguments. Can you conceive what they are?

A. No. I rather would suppose that its help consists not in revealing new arguments, but by enabling us to understand those revealed.

T. But you must not hide the subject from yourself by words without meaning. To enable a person to understand any subject, we explain it by illustrations, analogies, or more familiar terms. Is this what you mean?

A. No. The more I strive to explain my meaning, the less meaning I can find in myself upon the subject. I will reason no more in this way, for I see I cannot find premises to favor my conclusions. I will appeal to the scriptures.

T. To this I have no objection; for indeed this has been my object, to force you from all false reasonings to the scriptures. But now let me ask you, how are you going to make your appeal to the scriptures?

A. I will make my appeal to the whole book on the subject of conversion.

T. Conversion to Noah, to Moses, to John the Harbinger, and to Jesus Christ?

A No: I mean the instances recorded in the New Testament from the ascension of Jesus Christ.

T. That is fair ground. The Holy Spirit was not given until the day of Pentecost. Hence, if the Holy Spirit aided men to believe in Jesus Christ, it must have been subsequent to that date. Besides, it is conversion to Jesus Christ, and not to Moses, which interests us. Mention, then, any person of whom it is said that the Holy Spirit enabled him to believe.

A. I will begin with the preaching of the gospel after the ascension, and appeal to the first discourse. We are told in the 1st chapter of the Acts that Jesus commanded the Apostles not to preach until they were endued with power from on high. This was to help them to preach. For without this help from the Lord, they could not have spoken successfully.

T. True. But observe that the descent of the Holy Spirit was to help them to *prove* that what they spake was true. In this way persons can be helped to believe, and this is the only way in which one can help another to believe. For this help we contend. This was the use of the miracles, the tongues, the gifts of healing, the powers, &c. which attended the preaching of the Apostles. But you spake of an internal operation upon the mind to produce faith. You talk of a faith *wrought in the heart.* You might as well talk of light, or seeing wrought in the eye; of sound, or hearing wrought in the ear; of taste wrought in the tongue, or of feeling wrought in the hand. It is the quintessence of mysticism. To help one to see, we increase the light; to help one to hear, we speak loud. The creating of eyes and ears is a different work. But for this you do not plead. But this is only returning to the topics on which we spake at our last meeting. Mention only one person in all the New Testament who was aided, or who asked for help to believe.

A. The first three thousand converts.

T. You cannot allude to the first, or Jerusalem converts, for the miracles convinced them. This is the reason why they believed. Peter taught the first congregation the use of miracles in the following words: "Men of Israel, hear these words—Jesus the Nazarene was RECOMMENDED to you by God; by *powerful operations, and wonders, and signs, which God wrought by him in the midst of you,* as yourselves also know." The Holy Spirit also accompanied the speaker by visible and audible signs, which convinced the hearers that these things were as reported: but no Holy Spirit operated upon their hearts otherwise than through these glorious gifts. These pierced them to the heart. The Holy Spirit may figuratively be said to open the heart, to move or quicken the soul by these displays of its power and glory. Thus it opened by signs and wonders the hearts of 3000 on the first day of its advocacy of the pretensions of Jesus; for to plead his cause, and not its own, it was sent from heaven. The power of the Spirit as displayed on the cripple in Solomon's portico opened the ears and hearts of many: for after Peter had explained the miracle, the number of the men was about 000.

After the power displayed on Ananias and Sapphira, and after "many signs and wonders were wrought among the people by the hands of the Apostles, believers were the more added to the Lord — multitudes both of men and women." Again: The Lord opened the hearts of the Samaritans to attend to the things spoken by Philip, "beholding the miracles and signs which were done." Thus the Holy Spirit operates upon the hearts of men; but his dwelling *in* them is another matter. This was promised only to those who believe.

A. And are all the examples found in the Acts of the Apostles similar to those you have alluded to?

T. I have made no selections. I have taken them as they come. It is not usual to repeat all the same incidents in narrating similar events. The sacred historians, like other historians, in first describing any new events, are more particular in giving all the incidents. But were we to examine all the conversions found in the book, we should not find one to suit the popular imaginations on this subject.

A. What miracles did the Ethiopian eunuch see?

T. The Ethiopian eunuch, like Lydia, had his heart opened, as we have now, by reading and observing the ancient prophecies and recorded miracles of the Jewish scriptures. He, and Lydia, and the Bereans, are all cases in point. Of him it was said he was devoutly reading the Prophets; of Lydia it was said, she was a devout woman, whose heart the Lord had opened; and of the Bereans it is said, "they searched the scriptures daily whether these things were as reported; THEREFORE many of them believed." But, mark it, there was no need of a miracle to secure the attention of the eunuch to Philip—there was no need either of Philip's expounding the prophecies to him, if, as the theorists say, the Holy Spirit illuminates the mind, either by taking the veil from the scriptures or off the heart. But Philip preached Jesus from Isaiah, and by demonstrating what the Spirit had spoken concerning him, persuaded him to obey the

gospel. There is no mention of the Holy Spirit in this case, save that it induced Philip to preach to the eunuch, and took him hence when he had done.

A. But was not Saul of Tarsus struck down by the Holy Spirit, and convicted by its internal operation?

T. No. The Holy Spirit is not named in the whole narrative of Paul's conversion, till after Ananias visited him. It was then first mentioned to Paul. It was the Lord himself that appeared to Saul, to show him that he was the Messiah, that he might be an Apostle, and be able to say with the other Apostles that he both saw the Lord and heard him speak. If you will examine the same section that informs you of Saul's conversion, you will find other cases similar to those which I have already noticed. Peter bade Eneas, a paralytic of eight years standing, to be whole, and he arose immediately. The consequence was, that "all who dwelt in Lydda and Saron *saw* him and *turned* to the Lord." Dorcas, too, is raised to life by the same Apostle; and as soon as it was "known through Joppa, many believed in the Lord."

An acquaintance with the prophecies and ancient miracles, or a sight of the miracles of the New Mission, opened and prepared the hearts of Jews and Gentiles to obey the gospel. This is that *work of the Spirit* which is essential to *recommend* Jesus to men, and to enable them to believe on him. None are intelligent and true believers who believe not upon such evidence. This is all the Lord of the Spirit can do to produce faith; for he taught us that if men will not be persuaded by miracles and prophecies, by Moses and the Prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

A. I don't wish you to cite all the New Testament to prove this point. It is proved incomparably better now than half the thirty-nine articles of my grandfather's creed, and by more reasons than my father ever gave for becoming a Methodist, or my mother for becoming a Baptist. I can now see that the *external* evidences of christianity are externally operative upon the hearts of men; that they are addressed to unbelievers; that, in brief, these signs were written as well as wrought, that men might be able to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and that believing this they might be saved, or have life, through his name.

T. So an Apostle decides. The Spirit of God, the author of these proofs, by them opens men's minds to hear, to obey the gospel.—Those who obey the gospel are in that gospel declared to be sons of God, and as such receive the Holy Spirit, promised through faith, and are not only adopted, justified, sanctified, but filled with the spirit of sons, with all goodness, gentleness, and love.

A. It has been more from a wish to explore the whole *rationale* of this much vexed question than from any returning doubts, that I have led you more in the train of former reflections than into new associations of ideas, or permitted you to prosecute the developement of

some ideas expressed in our last interview. Unless something new occur to my mind on this subject, I will not call you back to it.

T. I shall take it for granted, then, that neither on any just principles of reason, nor from any declaration of scripture, can it be made either evident or probable that the Spirit of God, in producing faith, any other way operates upon the hearts of men than through the recommendations once given by signs and wonders, and all the variety of supernatural operations formerly addressed to the senses of mankind, and now written down and stamped with the indubitable marks of Divinity, open and plain to every one desirous of knowing the truth. In this way the Spirit now convinces men of sin, of righteousness, and future judgment, and opens their hearts to receive the gospel.

A. I discover many decided advantages resulting from a correct knowledge of this subject, among which this deserves attention, that admitting that this is the ancient, and the true way of producing faith, which I think must be conceded by the intelligent, then the efforts of all proclaimers, of all parents, guardians and instructers of youth, ought to be directed to developing and enforcing the certainty of the religion, by laying before the minds of the unconverted all the demonstrations of the Holy Spirit, and all the Divine attestations given to the mission of Jesus, that their faith may rest in the power of God, which was the foundation of the faith of the ancient converts, and which ever must be the only true foundation on which the faith of man can rest.

T. This is unquestionably plain. If we have the same faith which the first christians had, it must rest upon the power of God, the same power of God on which theirs rested. Happy they who, not having seen the actual displays of that power, yet, through the testimony confirmed by the blood of the original witnesses, and by all its internal and external evidences, do believe in Jesus!

This view of the matter is, moreover, equally honorable to the Spirit of God, and gives as much divinity, spirituality, and holiness to our faith, to say the least, as hypercalvinism itself. I would say, incomparably more; but we need not claim more. According to these principles, faith is the product of the Holy Spirit, wherever it is found. If true faith—if faith of the ancient school, it is the result of Divine influence; and he that requires greater proof of this matter, is prepared to question whether any thing be the gift of God which does not come direct from God without the ministry of angel, spirit, or the operations of the laws of nature.

This view of the question is equally opposed to the enthusiasm of preacher and hearer. This is the disgrace of this age. Next to the superstition of the dark ages is the enthusiasm of the present time. No wonder that atheists and sceptics scoff at our religion. Such an army of lilliputians in reason, and giants in noise, verbosity, declamation and shouting, never stood forth the advocates of christianity in any age or country as the preaching corps of these United States. The cause is the popularity of the prayer for "baptism in fire." Fire,

fire, holy fire, the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost, is the text, the sermon, the song, and the prayer.

The experiences told are the burnings of this fire: many of them are as fanatical as that which I shall now read you as the close of our present chat, to be resumed when you can find a convenient time. This I received yesterday from Princeton, Kentucky; the writer of it has found a key for interpreting the Revelation of John. He is at the head of the fanatics of this our day and generation— Ed.

"A BRIEF SKETCH

Of the experience of one who has passed through the gospel conversion; and now stands in the full faith of life and immortality for soul, spirit, and body on this globe.

Some ten years ago, I, as it were, imperceptibly fell under the most awful concern about things spiritual and eternal. To speak of the difficulties I met with is impracticable from the measure of scepticism and infidelity with which I was possessed, so as to threaten a disorganization of my mental faculties, from which I was miraculously delivered, as I was riding along in broad day, musing and meditating to the extent of my powers; when the visible heavens and earth seemed to sink into nothing, and I, surrounded with a light and glory which I could not have stood two instants, which impressed me with certainty there was a God, a Spirit, "above all and through all." Then my former difficulties of infidelity ceased, and a new scene of apparent difficulties arose. How so bright and glorious a being could be approached by so defiled and corrupted a one as I was? Seasons of prayer and abasement succeeded, until some six months after, I was again visited with a similar manifestation—that it was only through his mysterious manifestation in the flesh, that he could be approached. There a ray of certainty reached my mind, in relation to myself, that I had gained two points in the trinity. Then ensued a reading, sighing, fasting, and praying for the operation of the Holy Ghost upon my heart, to bring me into the just fear and favor of God. Some time rolled round and I experienced a conversion from darkness to light, which seemed to exhibit an ecstacy and power of eternal truth in an extraordinary manner, by wholly banishing doubt and fear for a time, and which was abundantly attended with seasons of high joy and sublimity. But soon found I was not converted from the power of Satan unto God, so as to let me continually move in the heaven-born spirit of love and equality. I then moved without sectarian bonds, among all the trinitarian churches, with charity to all others, until the overcoming Spirit saluted me, and I began to hunger and thirst for abiding substance, when I was led to peep into the celebic family, which seemed to captivate my every power, as it promised victory over sin in the destruction of all sensual appetites, by the sublime principle of God in man and man in God, so as to create a mountain of purity, of which the world should be ignorant; which, if so much as a beast touched, it should be stoned. Seasons and scenes of delight ran high with me here, until I found something which, to me, did not show the perfection of love. Occasional times of weeping and wailing succeeded, because I felt death was in the pot, so I struggled in spiritual morality, sustained by dreams and visions, fasting and prayer, until I experienced an internal, silent, solid peace, which really turned what I called curses into blessings, so much so, that I felt and expressed my conviction of being the subject of the first peace known on earth, and which continued for months, until sore temporal trials of principle suspended the sweet ecstacy, though left the rich, and assured confidence of the blessings of truth. So I stood in the full gaze of hope and expectation, until the testimony of life and immortality for body soul, and spirit, saluted my ear, from the most unlikely outward prospects of spiritual instruction. But I soon began to say within me, the half had not been told me, and all that was within me seemed to be crying, Lord, who is sufficient for these things? To believe that which is contrary to all past experience and

observation. Then seemed to be sorrow of sorrows; but as it was presented to me by faith, so I heard, and so it sprang up in my mind, and I came to believe that my body should endlessly exist on this globe, and I seem to have no power over my spirit to disbelieve it since; and I must farther say, when it (faith) reached the mind, it was the easiest thing I ever attempted. I will here remark, that a short time previous to this, at the end of four days fasting from food and water, faith and truth had been presented to my mind in a higher point of view than I had ever before looked upon them. And so I stand in the full assurance of *faith*, which delivers from the fear of death and judgment, together with all the snares, gins, pits, and prisons of ignorance and superstition, age and infirmities; and which does really let in the millennial brightness and glory of the Most High, so as to unite in an eternal oneness all things, above and below, that the sublime anthems of peace and good will may be sung in heaven, on the globe."

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. VI.*

HAVING now published every thing in Archippus' essays directly bearing on his peculiarity, I will close my review of his premises and reasonings by more formally attending to a favorite retreat from some of the plainest passages in the book. It is customary to elude such strong sayings as "*wash away your sins*," "*baptism saves us*," "*the washing of regeneration*," &c. by telling us gravely that these are *figurative expressions*; that baptism is but a *sign*, a *figure*, &c. A few words on these figurative expressions, and we have done with Archippus for the present:—

Is baptism a *sign* and *seal* of any thing? Those who contend that it just fills up the place of circumcision, argue that it is a sign and seal in the full sense of circumcision. For our part, let it be noted here, that we consider that *analogies* do not constitute *substitutes*. That there is a resemblance between circumcision and baptism we never doubted either as a Baptist, or as a Paidobaptist: but the discovery of an analogy between any two persons or institutions does not compel us to substitute the one for the other. There is an analogy between Adam and Christ, between Moses and Jesus; but we cannot thence infer that Christ stands in the room of Adam, nor in the place of Moses as a substitute or successor. There is an analogy between the redemption of Israel from Egyptian tyranny and the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There is an analogy between the immersion of Moses and the Jews in the cloud and sea, and the immersion of Jesus and his disciples; but they are not of the same import, nor is the latter a substitute for the former. There is an analogy between the Jewish Sabbath and the Lord's Day—between the Passover and the Lord's Supper—between the Year of Jubilee and the Reign of Grace—between the City of Refuge and Zion the City of the Lord. But we cannot, in good reason, nor in accordance with what is written by the Apostles, substitute one of these for the other. The weakness of even strong men, as well as of weak men, is most apparent in riding metaphors to death, in running parables out of breath, and in converting analogies into substitutes. Of this we have the most illustrious proofs in the thousand fruitless attempts which have been made to prove infant baptism from infant circumci-

sion; to make the circumcision of infant males, by their own mothers, on the eighth day, and of male servants because of their political relation to Abraham, a law and a precedent for sprinkling infants, male and female, on any day, by a Priest too, but not of male or female servants, nor of any person, adult or infant, on account of political relation to a son of Abraham.

But to the question again: "Is baptism a sign and seal of any thing?" Our best creeds answer the question in the affirmative. The Westminster speaks for most of the orthodox. It says, "Baptism is a *sign* and *seal* of the covenant of grace; of engrafting into Christ; of remission of sins," &c To be orthodox, then, we must say that "*baptism is a sign and seal of remission of sins.*" So far I am a Presbyterian, a Methodist, an Episcopalian, and a Roman Catholic. So far is Archippus orthodox also.

Let us, then, see what we mean by saying "Baptism is a *sign* and *seal* of remission." A *sign* and *seal* that our sins are remitted before we were baptized? Or is it a *sign* and *seal* that they will hereafter be remitted? These are the two great questions. None of our opponents maintain the latter. Hence the question is, *Is baptism a sign and seal of past remission?* "Of past remission," says Archippus; of *accompanying* remission, say we. Now for the argument. Are, then, we ask, the blessings stipulated in any covenant conveyed before it is sealed? or are they conveyed at the time of sealing? Doubtless not before, but at the time of sealing. One may stipulate, propose, and promise blessings in word or writing, and another may hear and believe the ability and faithfulness of him that proposes; but neither party is bound until the covenant is ratified. If, then, baptism be a seal of remission, or of a promise or covenant concerning remission, that promise, or blessing, or covenant cannot be received, nor secured, nor enjoyed until it be sealed. And just in the act of signing and sealing it is confirmed. If, then, baptism be a seal of remission, then no person is in fact pardoned until baptized. Now Archippus and our opponents, one and all, maintain, as far as we are informed, that baptism is a seal of remission of sins; consequently, they virtually, and in fact, contend that no person has secured to him, can receive or enjoy the remission of his sins, until he is baptized. But this is not the first time, nor the only time in which even the ingenuous are constrained to admit and adopt principles and premises subversive of their own prejudices and conclusions It is as hard to be consistent in defending error as it is to kick against the spurs without inflicting wounds upon ourselves.

But it is a *sign* of remission as well as a *seal.* Now it must be a sign in the same point of time in which it becomes a seal. It cannot be a sign of the past and a seal of the present. It must be a sign and seal in the same tense. And hence the propriety of the sign. Water is the cleansing element; and next to its refreshing influence when drunk, is its purifying efficacy on that which is polluted. It is applied not to the clean, but to the polluted, when applied either literally or figuratively. As it cannot be the means of literally cleansing what

is not polluted, so it cannot be the *sign* of cleansing any thing which is already clean. Its figurative truth depends upon its being applied to that which is figuratively polluted. It cannot be the sign of remission when applied to one who has received pardon; for in that case it would be a falsehood in a figure—it would be the sign of that which exists not. If, then, it be a *sign of remission*, no person conscious of being morally cleansed can rationally receive it. Its meaning and its truth both require that the subject of this sign be considered as not cleansed, as not washed, as not pardoned. If, then, baptism be a sign and seal of remission of sins, it is clear that the pardon of sins is not previous to, but attendant on, submission to it.

There are two passages in the New Testament on which Archippus and his brethren are not a little perplexed. The first is, that in which Paul is commanded by the authority of the Lord "*to wash away his sins.*" This, say they, is a figurative expression. So say we. But wherein is the figure? In the water of baptism. In submitting to immersion he washed away his sins. If before his immersion he had received literal remission, in immersion he could not be figuratively remitted. To suppose the contrary is to destroy the figure: for a figure implies something corresponding which is real. If there was no correspondence, there was no figure. If there was no real washing away of previous sins at that time, there could be no figurative washing of sins in that ordinance. I am as much astonished at their want of reflection as they are perplexed in evading these decisive testimonies of the sacred scriptures. Archippus might say that Paul received a real remission through faith, and a figurative remission in baptism, provided he could show that remission was not granted through faith only when accompanied by baptism. But to argue that Paul was literally forgiven three days before by faith, destroys the possibility that he was figuratively remitted in immersion.

We shall seek an analogy in a parallel case. Suppose, for example, that a controversy had arisen among us moderns on what constitutes marriage, or rather on what gives a woman a right to the name, honors, fortunes, and relations of a husband. All parties agree that three things are necessary to a true and proper marriage—the head, the heart, and the hand; or, to speak plainly, the belief of the professed affection of the suitor, the yielding of the affections, and the giving of the right hand in the forms prescribed by law, as a public pledge of devotion to that person. But while all parties agree in each and every one of these as necessary to a full and perfect marriage, a question arises among the curious whether in law or reason it is the first or last act that secures to the woman the name, the honors, the fortunes, and the relations of her suitor. One party contends that the moment she believes the professed affection of her suitor, she is married and has all the rights of a wife: but at the same time admits that this is a very peculiar sort of faith, and implies in it or attaches to it both the giving of the affections and the tendering of the hand according to law. The other contends that although faith and affection are in the order of things necessary antecedents, yet it is not one or

both of these, but the actual giving the right hand before witnesses, and as prescribed by law, which gives her any right, title, or interest in the name, honor, fortune, and relatives of the suitor.

In the course of these wordy strifes and debates on this question, one of the parties finds a document in the writings of certain political sages, whom all parties allow to be paramount authority in the case, and reads it in evidence of the justness of his position. He quotes one of these sages as saying to a certain eminent lady, "Arise—why do you tarry? give your hand, and become the wife of David, calling him your husband." His respondent says she was in reality his wife before, and this giving of the hand was but a figure: before this she had a right to the name, honors, fortunes, and friends of David; but this was only a figurative way of showing it forth publicly. But, replies his friend, why does the sage use words indicative that the relation was not yet formed: and this is not all, for on your own admission that giving the hand was but a sign or figure, let me ask, was it a figure of what had formerly been done, or a figure of what was to be done at the time of performing the act commanded? The parallelism for which we contend must be apparent to all; and I shall leave it to my friend Archippus to say whether the above words do not, when fairly interpreted, imply that she was not married until her hand was given, and therefore could have no right to the name, fortune, &c. of her suitor? And is not the giving of the hand a figure of the giving up the person whose hand it is, at that instant in which the hand is extended, and not a commemoration of some previous transaction between the parties? This we shall leave to his candor.

The second passage to which we refer is that in 1 Peter iii. 21. "To which water, the antitype immersion, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) now saves us also through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." These printed letters are the antitypes of the types which formed them. The type exists for the sake of the antitype. The deluge, then, in Peter's wisdom, was a type of immersion, and saves us by the resurrection of Jesus. Water saved Noah by an ark, while it drowned all who had not faith to enter the ark. The allusion to the Jewish washings, shows that the water of baptism is more effectual than the water which only sanctified to the purifying of the flesh. The Jewish washings did not make them who submitted to them perfect as respects the conscience. But by this institution understood, the answer of a good conscience is obtained. This answer of a good conscience is the difficulty with our friend Archippus. He would have the water of baptism only to take away the filth of the flesh or to have some commemorative retrospect to a good conscience obtained by faith. But Peter declares that immersion now saves us through the resurrection of Jesus. As this was a strong expression, Peter explains by saying it is baptism not for putting away the filth of the flesh, but *the answer of a good conscience.* This as certainly implies remission of sins, as did the command from this same Peter (the preacher of water!) on Pentecost. Baptized for the answer of a good con-

science, or for the remission of sins, are phrases metonomycally equipolent. *He that obtains the answer of a good conscience through immersion, obtains the remission of sins.* But he that does not, either mistook baptism or himself.

Having now attended to all the reasonings of our friend Archippus, we shall hear him assign what reasons he has to offer why sentence of heresy should not now be passed upon him.

EDITOR.

GROTIUS AND LE CLERC.

IT is useful to some minds to be informed that the most comprehensive and best cultivated minds, in all sects, have either virtually or formally contended for the distinguishing principles of the present proposed reformation. We rely exclusively upon what is written in the book, but many are strengthened in their convictions from the concurrent views of persons of elevated minds. For their sakes we have, on sundry occasions, backed our peculiarities, as some call them, from the concessions and declarations of men universally acknowledged to have been both great and good. Such is the reputation of Grotius and Le Clerc. Grotius' treatise "*De Veritate Christianæ Religionis*," is universally admitted to be one of the most masterly performances, and his name is enrolled amongst the first class of distinguished men. Our reading, and that of our correspondents, would enable us to furnish many interesting documents from the highest sources and human authorities, in vindication of our most offensive propositions. But originally deriving our views from the only infallible fountain of information, we are studious to draw our arguments from that source, and to recommend the study of the book rather than of human authorities for giving confidence and rest to the mind. We are willing to rest the controversy on the scripture premises alone; but when our opponents back their opinions by great names, we are willing to show them that great names can be arrayed against them— ED. M. H.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

No. I.

NI my researches into ecclesiastical history, I accidentally got hold of *Hugo Grotius* on the Christian Religion, who, it appears, wrote in the year 1638. The compiler, or reviewer of this work, in the close of the volume, has made, in my estimation, some very sensible and appropriate remarks. I design to take extracts from time to time and forward them to you, and should you think them worthy of a place in the *Harbinger*, you can lay them before your readers in order that they may see that good and great men have lamented the divisions among the worshippers of God, and labored to remedy this evil by calling their attention *to the word of God alone*:—

"Amongst christians," says Le Clerc, "that differ from each other, and not only differ, but (to their shame) condemn one another, and

with cruel hand *banish them from society;* to agree to any of them without examination, or, according to *their prescript*, to condemn others without consideration, shows a man not only to be imprudent, but *very rash and unjust.* That congregation which rejects, though but in part, the true religion (a representation he has formed in his own mind) and condemns him that believes it, cannot be thought by such a one a truly christian congregation in all things; nor cause that he should also condemn every man which that church shall deem worthy to be condemned and cast out of the society of christians. Wherefore a wise and honest man ought above all things to examine into these dissentions among christians, who they are that best deserve the holy name of disciples of Christ and adhere to them. If any one should ask what we are required to do by the christian religion, supposing there were no such christian society at all, amongst whom the true doctrine of Christ seems to be taught, and amongst whom there is not a necessity laid upon as condemning some doctrine which we judge to be true; in this case he who apprehends these errors ought to endeavor to withdraw others from them; in doing which he must use the greatest candor, joined with the highest prudence and constancy, lest he offend men without doing them any advantage, or lest all hopes of bringing them to truth and moderation be too suddenly cast off. In the mean time we are to speak modestly and prudently what we think to be truth; nor should any one be condemned by the judgment of another, as infected with error, who seems to think right. God has never forsaken, nor never will forsake the christian name so far as there shall remain no true christians, or, at least, such as cannot be brought back into the true way; with whom we may maintain a stricter society, if others will not return to a more sound opinion; and openly withdraw ourselves from the obstinate, (which yet we ought not to do without having tried all other means to no purpose,) if it be not allowed to speak your opinions fairly and modestly amongst them, and to forbear condemning those whom you think are not to be condemned. *The christian religion forbids us speaking contrary to our mind, and falsifying and condemning the innocent;* nor can he be acceptable to God, who, out of respect and admiration of those divine precepts, can endure any thing rather than they should be broke. Such a disposition of mind, arising from a sense of our duty and a most ardent love of God, cannot but be highly well pleasing to him."

"Wherefore, amongst Christians who differ from each other, we are to examine which of them all think the most right; nor are we ever to condemn any but such as seem to us worthy to be condemned, after a full examination of the matter; *and we are to adhere to those who do not require any doctrines to be believed which are esteemed by us to be* FALSE, *nor any to be condemned which we think to be* TRUE, IF WE CANNOT OBTAIN THIS OF ANY CHRISTIAN SOCIETY, WE, TOGETHER WITH THOSE WHO ARE OF THE SAME OPINION WITH OURSELVES, OUGHT TO SEPARATE FROM THEM ALL, THAT WE BETRAY NOT THE TRUTH, AND UTTER A FALSITY."

"But it is a question of no small importance, and not easily to be resolved, Who of all the societies of the present christians have the *truest opinions* and are most worthy of that name by which they are called. All the christian churches, as well those who have long since separated from the Roman church, as the Roman church itself, do every one of them claim this to themselves; and if we lay aside all the reasons, we ought no more to give credit to the one than the other; for it were a very foolish thing to suffer such a choice to be determined by *chance*, and to decide all controversies, as it were by the *cast of a die*. Now since Grotius has not proved the truth of the particular opinions of any present sect of christians, *but only that religion which was taught mankind by Christ and his Apostles; it follows that that sect of Christians is to be preferred before all others, which does most of all defend those things which Christ and his Apostles taught.* In a word, *that is in every particular truly the Christian religion, which, without any mixture of* HUMAN INVENTION, *may be wholly ascribed to Christ as the author.*"

"IF ANY ONE ADDS TO, OR DIMINISHES FROM THE DOCTRINE DELIVERED BY CHRIST, THE MORE HE ADDS OR DIMINISHES SO MUCH THE FARTHER HE GOES FROM THE TRUTH. Now when I speak of the *doctrine of Christ*, I mean by it the doctrine which all Christians are clearly agreed upon to be the doctrine of Christ; that is, which, according to the judgment of all Christians is EXPRESSLY TO BE FOUND IN THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.* As to those opinions, which, as some Christians think, were delivered by word of mouth by Christ and his Apostles, and derived to posterity in a different method, namely, either by tradition, which was done by speaking only, or which were preserved by some rite, as they imagine, and not set down in writing till a great while after; I shall pass no other judgment upon them here, but only this, that all christians are not agreed upon them as they are upon the *books of the New Testament.* I will not say they are false, unless they are repugnant to right reason and revelation; but only they are not agreed about the original of them, and therefore they are controverted among christians, who in other respects agree in those opinions, the truth of which *Grotius* has demonstrated, (*i. e. the New Testament;*) for no *wise man* (christian) *will allow us to depend upon a thing as certain, so long as it is uncertain to us*, especially if it be a matter of great importance."

T. M. H.

---

*"I confess some christians do sometimes say that those cannot be understood but by the doctrine of their church; but others again deny it; and (to mention but this one thing) that opinion is very suspicious which depends only on the testimony of those that affirm it, and they such whose chief interest it is that it should seem true. Others say that there is need of the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit, not only in order to the belief of the scriptures, but also in order to understand the meaning of the words contained it; which I do not see how it can be proved," &c. [My next will touch this part of his views. I am persuaded that if his views were attended to, it would lessen the strifes of the present day. He contends for the liberties of conscience as necessary to our accountability.

WASHING THE SAINTS' FEET.

WE have received sundry letters of late on this subject, as well as on former occasions. The following under date of July 7, 1831, calls the subject up:—

"*Mr. Campbell*—In this section of country much is said, and much collision exists among those who should be disciples of Jesus, on the subject of washing the christians' feet. The 13th chapter of John's testimony is adduced as legitimate proof of its being a church ordinance.* Others deny. From numerous requests, and expressive of my own feelings, an easay from your pen, through the medium of the Millennial Harbinger, is fervently solicited. Do, sir, as early as practicable, grant the request; for which you will receive our highest regard. Obediently, A SUBSCRIBER."

In the Christian Baptist for March, 1826, vol. 3, 2d ed. p. 336, the following remarks will be found:—

As to the *washing of the saints' feet*, there is no evidence that it was a religious ordinance, or an act of social worship. Yea, there is positive evidence that it was not. Paul, in his directions to Timothy, at Ephesus, tells him that certain widows were to be supported in certain circumstances by the church. These widows were members of the church, and as such must have been regular attendants on, and partakers of all its institutions.

Now in describing the character of those widows which were to be supported by the congregation, Paul says, "If she have brought up children; if she have lodged strangers; if she have washed the saints' feet; if she have diligently followed every good work." Had the washing of the saint's feet been a religious, or what is called a church or social ordinance, it would have been impossible for her to have been in the congregation, and not to have joined in it. He might as well have said, "If she have been baptized, if she have eaten the supper," as to have said, "if she have washed the saint's feet," had it been a religious institution. But he ranks it not amongst social acts of worship, not amongst religious institutions, but amongst *good works*. When, then, it is a *good work*, it ought to be performed, but never placed on a level with acts of religious worship. It is a good work when necessity calls for it, and though a menial service, the Saviour gave an example that no christian should forget, of that condescending humility which as christians we are bound, both from precept and example, to exhibit towards our brethren in all cases when called upon. Besides the design of it at the time he practised it, is ascertained from a regard to the mistaken and aspiring views of the disciples respecting the nature of places of honor in his kingdom.

It was a good work, and still is a good work, more frequently in Asia than America. The soil, climate, and dress of the Asiatics more frequently called for it than our circumstances require it. But we argue not from these circumstances—we use them as illustrations of the fact that Paul the Apostle has positively decided that it is not a religious institution, an act of religious worship, or an ordinance in the church, but simply a good work; and I have experienced it to be a good work in my own person more than once, even in these United States.

To this let me add, that *good works* being the fruits of wholesome principles, partake of the principles from which they proceed, as the apple partakes of the nature of the tree on which it hangs; but still the apple is not the tree. Neither are good works religion, but the fruits of religion. *Acts of worship* are not called in the scriptures *good works*; nor *good works*, *acts of worship*. Prayer, praise, immersion, the Lord's supper, are no where called *good works*. These

*"Ordinance—*a rule or law which is to be perpetuated in practice.*"*

are acts of worship. When an assembly comes together to worship God, it is preposterous to make *washing the saints' feet* a part of the worship, or a religious observance of the day. It is superstition, and not religion—it is converting a good work into a religious observance. But when the washing of a brother's feet is necessary to his health or comfort, we are taught to humble ourselves, if humility it may be, to serve in any way a son of God, an heir of immortality; I say, by the example of the son of God, we are taught to wash one another's feet. The passage is a most instructive one—John xiii, 12—17. "After he had washed their feet he put on his mantle, and replacing himself at the table, said to them, Do you understand what I have been doing to you? You call me the Teacher and the Master, and you say right; for so I am. If I, then, the Master and the Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that you should do as I have done unto you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his master, nor the apostle greater than he who sendeth him. Happy are you who know these things, provided you practise them!"

We do not wonder that they who love the Saviour would be desirous of imitating his example in this glorious act of condescension: nor do we wonder that some disciples, like Peter, should refuse at first to submit to have it done. Both, however, err. The brother who will not submit to have it done when preferred, and when it is necessary, deprives his brother of the pleasure of imitating the example of the Saviour of the world. And he who makes it an act of public worship, or rather a public usage, of the same significance and form of a stated part of religious worship, discriminates not between good works and the worship of God. Paul ranks the "washing of the saints' feet" with "visiting the afflicted and the lodging of strangers." See 1 Tim. v. 9—11. "Let no widow under sixty years old be put on the list. Having been the wife of one man, is she eminent for good works? Has she brought up children? Has she exercised hospitality? Has she washed the saints' feet? Has she assisted the afflicted? Has she been assiduous to perform every good work?" So it may be read—so Thomson has rendered it. It is, however, of the same signification in all versions. The remarks in the next article will reflect some more light on this.

THE HOLY KISS.

On this subject, too, we have had many queries; and many of our correspondents are very inquisitive on this, as well as every other practice which has the appearance of any apostolic sanction. After five years' observation of the tendencies of this practice, and experience of the revival of it, I do not find much to add to, or much to subtract from, the remarks we made upon it in the March number of the C. B. 1826. We shall lay them before the readers of the Harbinger. vol. 3, p. 337, 2d edition:—

Much the same sort of evidence exists in proof that the *kiss of charity* is not a social or church ordinance. A great deal more, however, can be said in behalf of it than of either of the preceding items. It is argued that it is *five* times

positively commanded in the epistles written to the congregations set in order by the Apostles. From this I would conclude that it had not been established by the Apostles as an act of religious or social worship in those societies as a part of their usual and stated worship; for if it had, there could not have existed a reason for enjoining it so repeatedly as we find it enjoined. Hence we do not find one commandment in all the epistles to the churches respecting baptism, the Lord's supper, or the Lord's day: certain things are said of them, and in relation to them, as already established in the church, but no command to observe them. From the fact of the kiss of charity being so often mentioned, and from the circumstances of the congregations to which it is mentioned, I argue quite differently from many zealous and exemplary christians.

Christians are to love one another *as brethren*. This is the grand standard of their affection. Whatever way, then, I express love to my natural brother I should express it to my christian brother. If the custom of the country and those habits of expressing affection which it familiarizes to our minds, require me to salute my natural brother when I meet him by a kiss on the lips, neck, or cheek, so let me salute my christian brother. But if the right hand of friendship and love be the highest expression of love and affection for a natural brother, to salute a christian brother otherwise is unnatural. For example—suppose that after an absence of seven years, I were introduced into a room where one of my natural brothers and one of my christian brethren were sitting, and that I should kiss the latter and shake hands with the former—would not this diversity be unnatural, and contrary to the generic precept, "Love as brethren?" I contend, then, that neither the customs in dress, wearing the beard, or mode of salutation, is the meaning of the requirements, of the precepts, or examples of the Apostles. But that the genius and spirit of these injunctions and examples, are, *in these things*, expressed by the customs and habits which our country and kindred adopt, and by means of which we express the spirit and temper which they inculcated and exhibited.

But to make this a regular and standing ordinance of christian assemblies appears to be entirely unauthorized by any hint, allusion, or command in the apostolic writings. I speak neither from prejudice nor aversion to this custom. For my own part, I can cordially comply with either custom, having been born in a country where this mode of salutation was more common than in this; but to advocate or enjoin it as of apostolic authority, I cannot. When misunderstandings and alienations take place amongst brethren, and a reconciliation has been effected; when long absence has been succeeded by a joyful interview; or when about to separate for a long time, the highest expressions of love and most affectionate salutations are naturally called for, which the customs of the country have made natural. And these become *holy* amongst christian brethren on account of the high considerations which elicit them.

In a word, whatever promotes love amongst christian brethren, whatever may increase their affection, or whatever expressions of it can best exhibit it to others, according to the customs and feelings of the people amongst whom we live, is certainly inculcated by the Apostles. And if christian societies should exactly and literally imitate and obey this injunction, no man, as far as I can learn, has a right to condemn or censure them. Nor have they who practise according to the letter, a right to insist upon others to think or practise in a similar way, so long as they exhibit that they love one another as brethren.

If the Romans had usually saluted one another with a holy kiss from the organization of the congregation, or had any other congregation, the Corinthian or Thessalonian, been taught this as a regular usage from their introduction into the kingdom, why would the Apostles, so many years after they had received the christian institution, have commanded them to salute one another with A holy kiss? Why not have simply reminded them of THE holy kiss, as he did of *the*

Lord's table, or *the* first day of the week, or *the* fellowship, or *the* collection for the saints?

Our brethren the Baptists, in Europe and America, for times immemorial have reasoned themselves in a similar way into a general practice from a special occurrence: in other words, they have drawn a general conclusion from a particular incident, and made it an essential part of the observance of christian immersion. Because we are told that Philip and the Eunuch went down *both into the water*, it is plead that the administrators must, *in all cases*, go down into the water with the subject of the institution. Thousands there are who would not think they had immersed a person according to the divine institution, and tens of thousands could be found who would not have peace of conscience if they had not been accompanied into the water by the baptizer. Now, with all due deference to the Baptist christendom, I would beg leave to say that I am logically compelled to infer from the narrative of Luke, that the accompanying of the Eunuch into the water on the part of Philip, was a peculiar circumstance occasioned by the position of the water to which they came. They came to a certain water, like many of our streams so shallow along its margin as not to admit of an immersion but by going some distance into it. The historian Luke tells all the circumstances of this singular incident, and explains how it became possible to immerse a person in such a stream. Remember, candid reader, that this is the only allusion in all the New Testament to the baptizers going with the candidate into the water; and that the *circumstances*, not the *meaning* of the institution, made it then and there necessary. In countries and cities where baths, public and private, were as common as brick ovens in Pennsylvania, there was no necessity, and certainly there is no meaning in the administrator's accompanying the subject into the water. Some imagine that John the Baptist was almost amphibious; that he stood in the Jordan all the day long; not noticing that there were certain places in the Jordan to which John resorted, *probably* too, because of the convenience which they afforded for immersing without walking into the stream with every candidate. They have also forgotten the *many baths* at Enon too, and the myriads immersed in cities. But I do not argue this question. For our own part we have *always* accompanied the candidate into the water, not as an essential part of the institution, nor as any part of it; but because, like Philip on the high road, we have found no place prepared where we could immerse conveniently without going down into the water.

But some person will say, Sir, your reasoning weakens the cause you plead. You plead for a restoration of the ancient order of things. When we are for doing every thing found in the book, you tell us some things are a part of that order of things and others are not. And moreover, you weaken our cause with the Paidobaptists: they will say some instances are recorded of believer baptism; but you Baptists reason illogically: these are particular cases, and from them you draw general conclusions. Very good: let them show only *one*

example for their practice before they talk of general or particular conclusions from their premises. The fact is, they have no premises at all, general or special. But we are not to be driven into fallacious reasonings by the perversity or obliquity of false reasoners. A weak or a false argument must soon or late injure a good cause. We care not what apparent advantage an opponent may find in any concession which a regard to just principles of reasoning, or to revealed truth, compels us to make. We will make all just and reasonable concessions; and when this is done, there is not a single item of the christian institution, in faith or practice, weakened, obscured, or misrepresented.

But to return from this digression, though illustration it may be called, to the kiss of charity. The congregation in Rome, and that in Corinth, are commanded to salute one another with a holy kiss; the congregation of the Thessalonians (1st Epistle) are commanded to salute all the brethren with a holy kiss; Peter also, in his first letters, commands all the brethren scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, and Bythynia, to salute one another with a kiss of love. Sometimes it is rendered *greet*, and sometimes *salute;* but it is one and the same word, "*aspazo*," in the Greek. Ten or twelve manuscripts with the Syriac version have "*holy kiss*," in Peter, instead of "*kiss of love*." It is also said by Justin Martyr in his apology for the Christians, "Prayers being ended, we salute one another with a kiss, and then the loaf and cup are brought to the President," &c. "There was no promiscuous kissing of males and females in the ancient christian meetings; because as all antiquity avouches, they adopted the mode of sitting in their assemblies which obtained in the Jewish synagogues. The females all sat together on one side, and the males on the other; and when they arose to salute one another, each saluted those who sat next them." So say some of the commentators on ancient usages. Here are all the premises in favor of the practice found in the apostolic epistles, and the best fragment of antiquity which has come down to us.

Sundry questions are proposed on these premises; first, Why is it called a *holy* kiss, and a kiss of *love?* It was called a *holy* kiss to distinguish it from a *common* kiss, which was the usual mode of salutation, and which is still the common mode of salutation in many eastern countries. D'Arvieux, (*Voy. dans la Pal.* p. 71) describing the meeting of Arabian chiefs, says—"All the Emirs came just together a little time after, accompanied by their friends and attendants, and after the usual civilities, caresses, *kissings of the beard* and of the hand, which every one gave and received according to his rank and dignity, they sat down upon mats." *Irwin* (in his Voyage, p. 248) says: "When the Shaik of Ghinnah held a court of justice and condemned his Vizier, he was immediately surrounded by a crowd of his courtiers, who *kissed his hands*, embraced his knees, and interceded with him for the pardon of his Vizier."

The Old Testament, in numerous passages, shows that kissing was a common practice among the Jews and in all the surrounding nations,

and that the Jews, in their dispersions, always kissed one another upon meeting. It became a proverb, in Solomon's time, "the kisses of an enemy are deceitful." Isaac said to Jacob, "come near and kiss me, my son." Pharaoh, in the Hebrew, says to Joseph—"At thy word shall all my people kiss." "Joab took Amasa by the beard, and kissed him;" and Judas betrayed the Saviour by a kiss. It was then a common salutation. There could have been no *holy* kiss if there had not been a *common* kiss, as there could not have been a deceitful or treacherous kiss if there had been no kiss of love.

But with us we have no common kiss; that is, we have no common salutation of this sort, either amongst males, or promiscuous between males and females: and it may be fairly a question among us, *whether we are justified in introducing new customs rather than in consecrating those which are in existence among us.*

If persons of all ranks, Jews and Gentiles, had not at that time been accustomed to salute one another with a kiss, it is, in my judgment, very obvious that no such a custom would have been originated by the Apostles. When Peter tells the brethren, in the dispersion, to salute one another with a kiss of love, it was no new custom commanded them, but a new version of an old custom—'you formerly saluted each other as *Jews* in this way, now do it as *christians.*' This is the force of his exhortation But there is a very great difference between sanctifying a customary expression of love and friendship to denote a higher love, or a different love, and introducing a new custom, never with us the sign or token of even common or uncommon friendship among men.

It cannot be, in the nature of things with us, at first, a natural expression of love; it is with us an *act of obediennce* rather than a spontaneous expression of affection. It becomes with us an *observance:* not so the shaking of hands. This is as natural as our mother tongue; but a kiss resembles a Frenchman speaking English, or an Englishman speaking French. It is the result of effort. The affection of an Asiatic flows to his lips, of an American to his hands. It requires some time and management to change its current.

But while these are, in our judgment, reasons against the introduction of such an usage, it is going beyond the bounds of every thing written in the book to enjoin it upon all churches as *the* holy kiss, and to make it an ordinance or usage in the stated meetings of the disciples. And to make it a common salutation every time we would, according to our custom, shake hands, is also travelling out of the record, and rather caricaturing than exhibiting christian affection. Every one who enjoins it upon another by Divine authority, mistakes the whole matter; *for affection or love cannot be regulated by* CONSCIENCE *at all,* and the Apostles never gave it as an injunction upon all churches, nor as an injunction upon any statedly, nor upon them once as a law, but as an exhortation with a reference to circumstances some way peculiar to them. It is not said to any congregation, Salute one another statedly, at any given period, but just when they received the letter from the Apostle. It must be so understood, because ranked among the other salutations in the close of the letter.

It does not appear that even on ordinary occasions the brethren saluted the Apostles with this peculiar kiss. Luke mentions it as one of the peculiarities of the parting scene at Miletus. The Ephesian elders "fell upon Paul's neck and kissed him." This is connected with their being much grieved, and sorely weeping at his final adieu.

Again, its effects upon society now are very different from what might have been expected among a people addicted to a common kiss. No mind then revolted at it, as unnatural or unbecoming; but experience creates more than a suspicion that it is, *when made a part of the christian institution*, prejudicial in some instances to its happy influences upon society. And he that taught that even things lawful were not always *expedient*, and who *became a Gentile* among Gentiles that he might gain Gentiles: who would neither eat flesh nor drink wine, rather than by so doing grieve the conscience of a weak brother, would never have originated among us in the remote west such a custom, any more than the custom of wearing beards or seamless garments, or writing on parchment rather than using types and paper.

We cannot answer all the questions submitted on this subject at this time. I have attended to one or two of them. If any brother has any reasons to offer against the views herein submitted, we will, with pleasure, publish them.

For our own part, I must again repeat, that while I would wash the feet of any disciple of Jesus Christ who would permit me, when it was a good work; and while I can say that I would salute any christian African on the continent with a holy kiss, if I regarded it as a part of the christian religion, as an essential custom, or a part of the fixed manners of Christ's family, I cannot treat any otherwise than I have done this subject, with regard to all my views of the whole institution, nor my brethren who practice the holy kiss in any other way than I have heretofore treated them: that is, salute them in this way on such occasions as *feeling*, *not conscience*, may prompt me or them; but as at present advised we cannot countenance them who would introduce this practice among us as one of the established customs or manners of the Christian Kingdom. On this subject, as on some others, we are taught to bear with one another, and while differences of opinion may exist, to maintain the unity of the Spirit by the bonds of peace. EDITOR.

ADDRESS TO REFORMERS.

THE ground assumed in the proposed reformation is the highest ground which can be assumed at any time or under any circumstances, and it is the only rational and lawful ground which human ingenuity and christian integrity can propose. It is not a restoration of primitive Methodism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Quakerism; but a restoration of primitive christianity in faith, sentiment, and practice—in religion, morality, economy, manners, and customs. If we fail it cannot be in the object proposed: for in this no people can excel us—none can claim higher, more rational, or more scriptural ground,

None can go farther back than the apostolic age—none can adopt a purer creed than the New Testament, nor recommend more wholesome practices than the Apostles enforced. If, too, christianity is ever to be restored, pure and heaven-born religion, to occupy the place of superstition, formality, ceromony, hypocrisy, enthusiasm, pharisaism, and sadduceeism; if the disciples of Jesus Christ are ever to be united, if sectarianism is ever to be put down, if the world is to be regenerated and its kingdoms to bow to the sceptre of Jesus, we are assured it must be by the means which we recommend, as far as moral means can effect these objects; it must be by placing the Apostles upon the thrones which Jesus promised them, by making them the infallible arbiters of every question of faith and morals, by regarding them as competent and faithful instructers of mankind upon the whole of religion and morality, and by submitting to their teaching, their recommendations, their entire system, without an admixture of humanism, however venerable, ancient, commendable, popular, or reasonable it may seem. If there be a rock, if there be a sure and well-tried foundation on which to build in the moral and religious desolations of christendom, this is the foundation. No man, with any pretensions to a very moderate quantum of knowledge in human affairs, in history, or the Bible, can expect that any human creed, or human system, or sectarian foundation, can achieve all that christianity proposes to do on earth, or even all that the great mass of professors expect and desire to be done. All the intelligent look for, long for, pray for, some great change in religious affairs, as preparatory to a better, a more desirable state of society.

It has been our lot, we know not why, to propose to the consideration of our cotemporaries the ground on which all that moral means can achieve may be accomplished; the ground on which all the devout, all the pure in heart, all the faithful, and honest, and honorable disciples of Jesus Christ can unite, co-operate, and cordially meet, without the sacrifice of any thing but human traditions, and without any infringement upon the rights of private judgment—without any discreditable or dishonorable concession whatever. We have all to carry to the same altar of truth and union our prejudices, and make a burnt-offering of our humanisms for the sake of the full enjoyment of the freedom of the City of the Prince of Peace.

The gospel as promulged by the Apostles, and the order of things which they instituted as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles, is all that is necessary to the attainment of the highest object to be gained on earth, and to secure to mankind the fullest enjoyment of christianity promised to man in this state of discipline and trial. Other foundation for the church, and for the union and harmony of all the family of God can no man lay than that which Jesus laid and the Apostles preached, which is the gospel, or *Jesus is the Christ.*

But it is not to commend, to explain, or to sustain the ground proposed we now address you. Of this you are already informed; though, perhaps, its full tendencies and results none of us fully, as yet, ap-

preciate or perceive. But, brethren, while we have seized the ground which heaven and earth must approbate, as far as earth can relish or approve the things of heaven; while we stand upon an eminence from which we can see the smoke of the many-tongued city, and the confusion of her inhabitants; while we have ascended to the foot of the apostolic thrones, let us remember that it is one thing to seize the best ground, and another to occupy it in the best manner. We have to unlearn what we have learned from human authorities, to unteach what we have taught of human traditions; we have to learn a new vocabulary; and what is still more difficult, we have to learn to practice what we preach—*to cultivate and to exhibit the spirit of the ancient gospel*, and to abound in all the good works which it commands and commends. And who of us, nurtured in the bosom of our meretricious mothers; who of us, nursed and cherished in the lap of sectarian affections; who of us, educated in the schools of an apostate church, can at a single effort, or by a few good resolutions, free ourselves from all these Babylonish influences and habits, and exhibit the simplicity, the meekness, mildness, purity, zeal and heavenly mindedness which adorned the first advocates for the sovereignty of Jesus the Messiah?

I speak not of that lame charity which only mutters out the defections of the age; nor of that "christian spirit" which bids God speed to every thing which assumes the garb of religion, which flatters the inventor of every scheme, which virtually dethrones the Lord of Christians, and which recommends every device that decorates itself with the character of christian benevolence. I speak not of that mildness, gentleness, and meekness which dare not reprove the works of darkness, nor rebuke with authority the corruptions of the gospel of salvation; which fraternize with all who evince sincerity, regardless of the principles with which that sincerity is allied. But I speak of that mildness, gentleness, and meekness which instruct with condescension them that oppose themselves, which discriminate between the deceiver and the deceived, which soften with sympathy and tenderness the testimony we offer against error, and which regard with all benevolence the subjects of mistake, error, and delusion.

The Editor is at fault here if his motives and the reasons of his conduct are not estimated according to his conceptions of the state of society when he began his efforts in this cause. He viewed the whole christian community as a physician views a plethoric paralytic patient. Desperate diseases require desperate remedies. The lancet, blisters, and the severest friction are the mildest remedies to restore sensibility and a healthy action of the nervous system to such unfortunate invalids. In a word, and without a figure, he regarded the so called christian community as having lost all healthy excitability; and his first volume of the "Christian Baptist," the "most uncharitable," the most severe, sarcastic, and ironical he ever wrote, was an experiment to ascertain whether society could be moved by fear or rage—whether it could be made feel at all the decisive symptoms of the mortal malady which was consuming the last spark

of moral life and motion. It operated favorably upon the whole, though very unfavorably to the reputation of its author as respected his "christian spirit." It brought some hundreds to their senses: and as the morbid action began to yield and to be succeeded by more favorable symptoms, he gradually changed his course, and has been ever since adjusting his *modus medendii** to the indications of the disease. He has obtained a favorable hearing to a very considerable extent, incomparably beyond all his expectations; and now begins to think of still more radical changes in his course. His preaching, however, has always differed much from his writing. He never thought that a promiscuous assembly, convened to be addressed on the great principles of reformation towards God and faith in Jesus Christ, ought to be addressed as expediency may justify him to write. He has frequently happily disappointed his hearers. They expected a portion of pepper, and salt, and vinegar; but on many occasions have confessed it was manna, and wine, and oil. But in speaking he addressed not systems nor system-makers, but men and women, saints and sinners. To edify the former and to convert the latter, was, then, the all-absorbing consideration.

He is obliged to give this account of himself because he has learned from various sources that the severity of his writing has been appealed to in vindication of severity in preaching, and of harsh and sarcastic addresses to the great congregation. If he have knowingly ever addressed a congregation in this style, it was when the clergy and their vindicators were present; and if at any other time, he confesses he was at fault, and asks forgiveness.

But, brethren, while we proclaim the ancient gospel, let us do it in the spirit of that gospel. Let our object be to turn sinners to God. Gravity, sincerity, mildness, and benevolence, must be the attributes of every successful proclaimer of the word. If we teach or exhort christians, let it be with the tenderness, affection, and long-suffering of Paul and his great master—the Teacher sent from God. No witticisms, puns, jests, or satires, become him who pleads with men to be reconciled to God. A dead fly has often caused the most precious ointment of a whole discourse to send forth an unpleasant odor.

But my address is not only to them who labor in the word and teaching, but to all who have come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. The cause you have espoused is the most dignified on earth. All in heaven approve it; but we have made ourselves a mark for the archers, and their bows, though not like ours, bows of steel, send forth many missiles. Let us be clothed with the armor of light, *take hold of the sword of the Spirit*, and fight the battles of the Lord, with coolness, courage, and perseverance. But temper, good temper, love, tenderness, and all condescension to the infirmities of our contemporaries, next to our giving a living form to the whole religion in our whole behavior, are worth all the rhetoric and logic of the schools, and infinitely more powerful than all the censures, sarcasms, ironies, and smart sayings of all the wits of the age. But of this more hereafter.

EDITOR.

*Mode of healing.

GOOD NEWS FROM WALES.

Extract of a letter from Pittsburg, dated August 2, 1831.

"I HAD the pleasure of conversing the other day with two persons from Wales, who have recently emigrated to this place, and united themselves to the congregation here. They cannot speak good English; but I learned from them the following interesting particulars:—

"The gospel is proclaimed with great success in the north part of Wales, and the ancient order of things is in a good measure restored in some congregations in that country—in how many we could not learn. The congregation from which these disciples came assemble on the first day of every week, having two Bishops or Presidents; one is a very old man, not able to speak much; the other, a younger man, labors in the word and teaching, and occupies in the congregation a good part of the afternoon meeting. When they assemble in the morning they first attend on prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, and some of the brethren exhort or address the congregation. An address to those without is then tendered, and an invitation given to any who have heard and believed the gospel to obey it—to come forward and confess the Lord.

"Those who come forward are required to make the same confession which Philip required of the Eunuch. They are then immersed with these views. They represent the persons immersed as first having been begotten of the word; as soon as they ascend from the water they contemplate them as newborn babes, and now to become the subjects of such impressions as are to be made upon them by their mother, the congregation. In the next meeting, on the same day, the newborn, or immersed, are embraced or saluted by the brethren, and they all assemble round the Lord's table, and eat and drink in memory of their Lord and Saviour, and rejoice with the new converts in having obtained the remission of their sins and the hope of immortality.

"These brethren thought that out of Wales there were no people who thus understood the gospel and practised the same things. They had just adopted the book for themselves, and were led to these views and practices from reading it alone. Shortly before leaving Wales they had heard that this same gospel and pretty much the same order of things were taught in these United States, and were as much astonished as delighted to hear it. When I heard their narrative I thanked God and took courage.

"Yours in the Lord, R. D."

THE ancient gospel is now proclaimed in Great Britain, Ireland, the Canadas, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and in every state and territory in this union, and is daily diffusing its influences on society. The community seems to be prepared for it. Thinking and intelligent persons are every where jaded and sickened with sectarianism, and there appears a more general disposition or determination to abandon all human platforms, creeds, and rubrics, and to build upon the Apostles and Jesus Christ alone, than ever appeared in chris-

tendom before. To this cause, as well as to others, we attribute the almost unparalleled progress of the ancient gospel and order of things; which, indeed, in contrast with any sectarian scheme, when carried out fully presents a new religion both in faith, hope, love, and their tendencies. Many societies are, it is true, yet but talking about these things and recommending them; but the proof of the excellency of this cause is the carrying out of all its principles into full practice.

EDITOR.

A. H. COHEN.—NO. II.

Dear Sir,

A SNEER from you at the dream of Joseph comes with a worse grace than all the sneers of Voltaire against Moses and Jesus. What! a Jew sneer at the dream of Joseph, when the dream of another Joseph saved your nation from famine, from starvation! But perhaps you will tell me that your father Levi, and all his brethren, did not believe in the dreams of Joseph! Yes, and you may add, not only hated him because of his dreams, but sold him a slave for the price which Judas set upon the head of the Messiah: and why? because he dreamed a dream which your fathers did not like. But recollect, my good sir, that Joseph's dream made him a slave because his brethren hated him, but Pharaoh's dream made him a governor, because the Lord was with him; and therefore your father Jacob and all his sons bowed to him.

Remember, my dear sir, that the dream of an Egyptian king saved your mother Sarah from the bed of Abimelech, and thus verified the prediction that she should be the mother of the child promised to Abraham as the inheritor of Canaan. Why then, son of Sarah, should you laugh at the dream of Joseph, so similar to those dreams which saved your nation from ruin, and without which the promises to Abraham could not have been fulfilled?

Your first objection, which you represent as the great "*stumbling block*," having been disposed of and shown to be a verification of one of the most literal promises of Isaiah, I will just notice your allusions to John the Harbinger. These are full as logical as your allusions to the dream of Joseph. To notice the "*shall come*," and the "*is already come*," may appear on my part giving importance to that which few of your brethren may think worthy of much consideration. All authors are guilty of making quotations from the tongues and pens of men. To quote a passage in the tense in which it *was* spoken, and then declare that it *is* fulfilled, is surely not a monstrous contradiction! And for John to say that he was not Elias, nor *the prophet* of which his contemporaries spoke; for him to tell the truth, cannot, indeed, be a very great sin in your eyes. John was a reformer like Elias; and it is neither unprecedented nor unusual, in all languages and among all people, to give a person the name of one renowned for the qualities, good or evil, which he possesses. Of a certain minister of state we say, he was the Ahitophel or the Talleyrand of that Court; of a king renowned for wisdom we say, he was

the Solomon of that age. John the Baptist was the Elijah of his time. He came in the spirit and in the power of Elijah.

The prediction in Malachi was fulfilled in John, and *never can be fulfilled in any other person*—"I send my messenger before thy face." He was to appear before the destruction of the second temple: "Even the Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to his temple." And soon after him was to come "the great and terrible day of the Lord" on the land of Judea, on the city and temple. Now that John filled the whole scope of the prediction as to his office, work, time of coming, and all the adjuncts thereof, cannot be denied. But no person can now come to the temple of the Lord which stood in Jerusalem; no person can come *before* that great and terrible calamity on your city, temple, land, and people. Now I ask you, as a son of Abraham, as a man of good reason, is it argumentative, is it rational to oppose to these incontrovertible facts the mere criticism, I will not call it quibble, about the *name* Elijah.

Some of your scribes used to teach that in the times of the Messiah both Moses and Elijah should revisit the land of Judea, in their own proper persons. This tradition, you know, obtained much credit with your people. And it came to pass that Moses and Elijah did, in their own proper persons, visit the land of Judea in the time of the Messiah. Now if you quote the words of Matthew and John, and reason from them as having been sincerely and honestly spoken, just as they appear on record, you have as good reason to admit his testimony concerning what happened in the Mount when Moses and Elias appeared.

As to the *two disciples* sent by John to Jesus—whether for their own confirmation, or for the removal of some doubts of his own, not concerning the mission of Jesus from the Father, but concerning other matters—I can see no real difficulty which it can create, as to the pretensions of Jesus, more than the frequent mistakes and questions proposed by his own disciples concerning the nature of his kingdom, whether it was to be temporal and worldly, or whether he was to suffer or be glorified on earth. There is no contradiction in these incidents to any thing prophesied concerning either Elijah or the Messiah. John may have fallen into doubts whether there was another messenger to be sent from Heaven, or whether the kingdom which he, in common with all that generation, expected to be of this world, was then to be set up, as it may have transcended the time which he had fixed for its coming. But his mission was not to explain that kingdom, but to announce its near approach, and to call upon men to reform. But if he sent his disciples for their own conviction or confirmation, which many christian rabbis have plead, it obviates your difficulty at once. For my own part, I am of opinion that John, having had the common views of this kingdom, and not seeing any immediate tokens of its appearance, fell into difficulties about the meaning and design of the mission of Jesus. This, I think, is implied in the answer given to his queries. But the least in the kingdom of heaven was, in this respect, greater than John. Now, as it de-

tracts not from the respect you have for any one of the Jewish prophets because he did not know and foretell every thing, it ought not in your judgment to detract from the mission of John, as coming in the spirit and power of Elijah, *because he had no better conceptions of the kingdom and mission of the Messiah than Elijah had*, though it appears he was much more enlightened than even Elijah himself.

As to your objection drawn from the predictions of the extent, duration, and prosperity of his reign, they may easily be removed from an examination of your prophets. The time when, the place where, his kingdom was to commence, its rise, progress, and consummation, are so frequently and fully developed in your prophets that it astonishes me to see you select a passage which alludes to the consummation of his kingdom, and quote in connexion with it a saying of Jesus respecting its commencement, or rather concerning his own personal labors in proving his mission. You might as well have opposed the fame of the Cesars, of Hannibal, or of Napoleon, by telling us some incident of their childhood, as to oppose the predictions of the triumphs of the Messiah to the narrative of the commencement of his career. Ought not the Messiah first to have suffered, and then to have entered into his glory, was a question which myriads of your nation unanimously decided in the affirmative, and in confirmation of which your David writes many a psalm. So fully convinced of the many sufferings, and trials, and conflicts of the Messiah foretold in your prophets are many of your Rabbims, that they have to adopt the hypothesis of two Messiahs—a suffering, and triumphant Messiah. This is good proof that your prophets say much of the sufferings of the Messiah, yourselves being judges. But a call from home compels me to break off in the midst of this investigation, which I shall resume in my next.

In all sincerity, your friend. EDITOR.

THE EXTRA,

EXAMINED BY MR. ANDREW BROADDUS.

BY some singular arrangement, management, or accident, this pamphlet of 56 8vo. pages made its way past me to the lower country, and was read by persons nearly 300 miles west of me before I heard of its appearance. About a week ago I read a letter from the lower part of Ohio, from brother *Winans*, containing his views of the "*Extra Examined*," which he had read I dont know how long before. This was the first time I heard of its appearance; and it was not until yesterday (August 23) that I saw it. I have only glanced over a part of it, and about starting to attend some meetings at the distance of more than 50 miles, will not, perhaps, for two weeks to come, have leisure to read it all carefully. But having only very hastily read a part of it. I can do little more at present than announce its appearance.

Mr. Broaddus (for he wishes me to call him *Mr.* Broaddus, calling me *Mr.* Campbell,) has made the most gentlemanly effort to maintain the views of faith, justification by faith, the previous holy principle,

and regeneration of the heart, found in Mr. Fuller's works, which has appeared since the present controversy began. I do not, by naming Mr. Fuller, impute to Mr. Broaddus the mere detailing of his views in opposition to what he calls my "theory." I presume that he does not contend for Mr. Fuller's views, but for his own; but I say Mr. Fuller's views, because they are so generally known, and it is the most summary way of informing my readers of the ground on which the Extra is opposed.

Mr. Broaddus has acquitted himself well, and no doubt will receive the thanks of all our opponents for this effort. He now receives mine too, for having produced a *decent* pamphlet, written in the style of a gentleman, and in what is usually called "the spirit of a christian." I do not think that he has designed, in any passage which I have read, to misrepresent my views, though in some places he has misapprehended them, and certainly has not, in my judgment, fairly met the great question at issue. That he has said many plausible and specious things which will pass for sound logic with many of our opponents, I doubt not. He has been at great pains to represent christian immersion as a mere "bodily act," and to speak of it as "*an external act*," "*an external ordinance*," &c. pretty much like the immersion of a cup, a table, or a couch in water.

He also represents me as notoriously careless about the heart, as having never said or written much about the heart or the state of the mind; as, indeed, not taking that much, if at all, into the account. His words are, "The great error which lies at the bottom of Mr. C's theory, of the actual forgiveness of sins in baptism, appears to consist in *an undervaluing of the exercises of the heart, and attaching to external conduct or action the importance which really belongs to these exercises*." The above sentence is printed and *italicised* as above. I doubt not but Mr. Broaddus thinks this is all correct; and yet a more unjust representation of my views was never penned. I cannot blame Mr. Broaddus for censuring in strong terms a view of christianity against which such a charge could fairly lie. I would join with him and denounce such a representation of christianity as leaves the heart of man not only out of view, but on the back ground. How often have we said that the greatest objection we have against the whole system which we oppose, is because of its impotency on the heart? But Mr. Broaddus thinks that his system is the only one which takes the heart of man into good keeping; and consequently, he that dissents from him leaves the heart out of view.

I do not argue any point at issue; I only inform the public that Mr. Broaddus has written a very respectable pamphlet on the Extra, and that he has, as he conceives, scattered the pillars on which our edifice was reared. But we intend, so soon as we can find a little leisure, to gather the broken fragments and erect for ourselves a shelter from the storm!

I do not know a proposition in nature or religion against which both plausible and ingenious things may not be said. Men may argue that the Sun is not the fountain of light, and urge the many dark

spots of immense magnitude which appear upon its disk as proof that it is not a luminous, but an *illuminated* body. Mr. Broaddus has, however, the popular and much hackneyed side of the question, and whatever is *familiar* to many is both rational and scriptural. To the Quaker it is most unreasonable to propose water, bread, or wine in religion. They are mere *external* and *bodily acts;* and so is bending the knee, or singing a song, or making an audible prayer. To the Paidobaptist the dedicating infants to the Lord in baptism is a most rational and commendable act; and to every one what has been most familiar and most common among those he calls wise and good, is, to him, most rational and scriptural. Of great importance, then, it is to be educated in the true and proper meaning of the Holy Scriptures.

But we shall, as soon as possible, under all our circumstances, attempt not only to examine the "*Extra Examined*," but the principles assumed by its author, and to fortify by additional bulwarks the citadel of truth. We hope to exhibit all candor in our Review, and to convince even our friend Broaddus that he has misconceived some very essential matters. Wherever he has found a weak place we will acknowledge it; show that he has not met the real question in the Extra; that he has failed in expounding the passages of Scripture on which we relied, (some of them are not noticed at all in their place;) and, what may astonish him not a little, we expect to demonstrate that he has conceded principles which subvert his own reasonings and establish the views which he opposes. But when we have read the whole piece we will, perhaps, change in some respects our opinion of it.

EDITOR.

AN EVIL REPORT CORRECTED.

IT has been stated to us that two Unitarian Universalist preachers from New York, now in Virginia, lately in Richmond, are represented, or represent themselves, as being one with us in faith; if so, they are not *Unitarian Universalists*, for we fraternize with none who preach that he that believeth not shall be saved; that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God; and that the cowards, the unbelieving, the abominable, murderers, whoremongers, sorcerers, idolators, and all liars and deceivers, shall have their part in the New Jerusalem in the presence of God and the Lamb forever: nor with any called *Unitarians*, who give to Jesus no higher honors than to Moses; who represent him as not entitled to any honor but the honors of an official name; in fine, who do not acknowledge him to be truly God's own Son, and as well entitled to divine honors as the Father who sent him. If the Father be Divine, we must regard the Son as Divine also. But we fraternize with all who speak of life and death, of heaven and hell, of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as the Apostles spoke, and who act conformably to the revealed will of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

From the Cincinnati Gazette.

WE publish to-day a communication on the subject of Hydrophobia, that deserves some attention. Since this communication was on file, another article on the same subject, from the New Hampshire Gazette, met my eye. It is also subjoined.

HYDROPHOBIA.

This most distressing and horrific malady, which, from the days of Aristotle, (who first wrote of it,) to the present time, has resisted all the powers of medicine, and bid defiance to Esculapian skill, has at length been conquered. Notwithstanding this disease is of such unequalled stubbornness of character, that it has never been known to yield in the least degree to medical treatment, until the constitution and all the powers of animal life have been prostrated and extinguished, its potent and deadly course has been stayed by the superior power of the Thompsonian system of medicine. Under the treatment of this system, in the incipient stages of the disease, and before the symptoms were fully developed, persons who were bitten by rabid animals have been cured in different parts of the United States; but the recent case of Mr. Clark, in this city, has afforded the first opportunity for testing the power of the system in a confirmed state of the disease. In this case the symptoms were so fully developed as to carry conviction to all who saw him before he was put under medical treatment, that it was a clear and confirmed case of hydrophobia. This was acknowledged by a number of medical gentlemen, among whom were two professors in the Medical College of Ohio.

These facts strongly recommend a fair trial of the system to all who are unacquainted with its extraordinary and salutary powers. In short, its congeniality with animal nature is such, that although its power is unequalled by any thing known in the school of medicine, in resolving obstructions, dilating contracted vessels, allaying all morbid excitements and nervous irritations, restoring the lost energies, and equalizing the action of the whole system, that it may be applied, with care and perseverance, as far as is necessary to produce a revolution of the most stubborn fever, in its incipient stage, and the same course upon the same patient, be ten times repeated to the same degree, without any danger of undermining the constitution, or prostrating the vital powers.

This proposition has been fairly tested in the case of Mr. Clark, and it is ardently hoped and believed that community will derive much benefit from the knowledge which this important cure is calculated to impart.

There are, however, not a few among us at present who duly appreciate the merits of the new system in all its bearings, who have seen friends and relatives apparently snatched from an untimely grave by its salutary effects, after other medicines had been given in vain, or worse than in vain; others, after suffering and groaning for years under affliction, and all the pangs of disease and bereavement, have been relieved and restored to health and vigor, and now mountains of gold could not induce them to abandon and renounce the system, and revert to those remedies that undermine the constitution, enervate the system, and entail upon those who are pronounced *cured* a perpetual disease, which renders life a burthen.

Men of medical science, perhaps, will not agree with the above statements, nor admit the solitary case of Mr. Clark as satisfactory demonstration; but since it is universally acknowledged that there is no known remedy for hydrophobia in the old Materia Medica, nor a solitary and indisputable cure reported, physicians of every order would do well to recommend the Thompsonian system in this disease, provided it could be under the management of some judicious and experienced practitioner in that order.

Experience in the system is all-important, inasmuch as the symptoms frequently produced by its singular operations in stubborn disease, which would be encouraging to the experienced Thompsonian, would produce alarm in any one not acquainted with its manner of operating in such cases, and probably induce him to resort to some other mode of treatment, which might be danger-

ous and even prove fatal to the patient. The reputation of the system, like every thing else that is good, has suffered much from ignoramuses, quacks, and unprincipled men; while its doctrines, averse to those taught in the halls of medical science, have been at once rejected by scholastic theorists without trial or investigation; though men of all ranks and conditions in life, learned and unlearned, who have acquainted themselves with its intrinsic value, have pronounced a verdict in its favor.

If there is any who conceives it to be absurd and dangerous, and will, by fair deduction from established premises, show wherein the absurdity and danger lie, I promise, for one, to be convinced, and to acknowledge it publicly, or to show the reason why I am not convinced. WM. RIPLEY.

CURE FOR HYDROPHOBIA.

The following article was written at our request—as we conceive it to be the duty of every one who has in his possession a valuable secret, to let the world have the benefit of it in some way or other.

North Hampton, July 14, 1831.

Agreeable to your request, I have looked for the minutes I took several years ago of information given me by Dr. Benajah Sanborn, an aged and respectable physician, of Sandbornton, in this state, respecting his treatment of Hydrophobia, and his success.

The principal remedy was a strong decoction of *lobelia*, given in frequent doses till it operated as an emetic, and continued, but less frequently, afterward.

When first called to the patient, he administered immediately, while the lobelia was preparing, a powder composed (for an adult) of 1 grain of camphor, 1 of opium, 2 of digitalis, finely pulverized and given in molasses. Half that quantity he would give to the smallest child.

In a case in which the disease was considerably advanced, he gave the powder once in 30 minutes three times, and afterwards once in four hours.

If I recollect rightly, Dr. Sanborn made the experiment with lobelia first on swine. The swine of four families, in the borders of Sanbornton and Meredith, were bitten by a mad dog. The lobelia was given soon to the swine of three of the families, and not of the other. The animals to which it was given all lived, and the others all died of hydrophobia.

Dr. Sanborn was called to visit a son of 'Squire Mooney, of Canterbury, about nine years old, who had been bitten by a mad dog. It was the eleventh day of his disease. He had become very wild, and could not drink. It was necessary to confine him, and, if I remember correctly, to pry open his mouth in order to give the medicine. What was first forced into his mouth was thrown out at his mouth and nose. Continual efforts were made with success. In about three hours he was able to sit at the table, and take tea with the family comfortably.

Dr. Sanborn was called to visit Mr. Noah Newell, of Reading, Mass. who was cured of hydrophobia by the same method of treatment.

It is perhaps generally known that lobelia is the plant which causes horses to slaver so freely in the summer and autumn. It is very common in our pastures and often found by the sides of our roads.——Yours respectfully,

JONA. FRENCH.

TIME.

TOO late I staid; forgive the crime,
Unheeded flew the hours;
How noiseless falls the foot of time
That only treads on flowers!

O! who with clear account, remarks
The ebbing of the glass,
When all its sands are diamond sparks
That dazzle as they pass?

Or who to sober measurement
Time's happy swiftness brings,
When birds of Paradise have lent
Their plumage to its wings?

R. W. SPENCER.

From the Christian Index.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN INDEX.

Sir—I have been a member of a Baptist church nearly 20 years, and until within the last two years I knew nothing whatever of "Temperance Societies," as they are by themselves designated. In the land of my nativity there is, in seaport and manufacturing towns, much "intemperance," or drunkenness, practised among a certain description of people, although ardent spirits is not usually drank; but I do not think that systematic drunkenness is near so extensive, or so morally injurious to the people, as it is stated to be in this country. In my own happy country, there are various societies instituted for the encouragement of piety and virtue, and for the suppression of vice and immorality. But I never knew or heard of a society, since civil and religious liberty have been properly understood, assuming to itself the prerogative of sitting in judgment on the consciences of their christian brethren, and of making that a *test* of christianity or of christian character, which is *not authorized by the Word of God.* Your self-styled "Temperance Societies" go much further in this respect than the scriptures authorize them to do, and, as it appears to me, take a savage pleasure in ridiculing and defaming the characters and motives of those who cannot see either reason or propriety in conforming to their rules. Now, sir, much more cogent reasons and authoritative arguments than have as yet been given must be adduced, to satisfy my mind that a *temperate* use of what is provided by an indulgent Providence is sinful, or that to use it with discretion can be injurious to the morals or the condition of my fellow-men. The gfiace of *God*, as well as the gifts of *His Providence*, are subjected to abuse. But because wicked and unregenerate men abuse them to their own destruction, is no reason for my partaking of *neither* of them, or for my rejection of *either* of them. And before I can admit the competency of "Temperance Societies" to become judges in this case, they must bring unequivocal, unwrested, and direct testimony from the *word of God*, as their authority. Thanks to our heavenly Father, the day of *human* authority in matters of faith and conscience, is gone by. You are aware, Mr. Editor, that the roar of artillery, or the thunders of excommunicating laws, when they derive not their authority direct from the word of God, have no effect upon intelligent Baptists who are settled in their convictions of the truth of their sentiments. And they will not, that the word of God be superseded by human laws, and be made of none effect. Had it not been for the supercilious tone of "Temperate Societies," and had it not appeared to me that their proceedings are supererogatory, and that they are not seeking an extension of their principles in the exercise of christian love and charity towards those who, from not being able to perceive the necessity or consistency of their conduct, cannot conscientiously unite with them, you would not have been troubled with this letter—my object in writing it is not to palliate intemperance in any shape whatever. *Intemperance is forbidden by the word of God;* and that, in my mind, settles the question. But

it does not follow from hence, that a moderate and circumspect use of the gifts of Divine Providence, in any way, must be denominated sinful, or injurious to mankind. And for any man, or set of men, by whatever name distinguished, to designate others who are as anxious as themselves to promote the same ends, "lovers of their cups"—as being "more injurious to society than practised and confirmed drunkards"—"murderers" of their fellow-men—and "Satan's agents" to send the souls of men to perdition, is unwarrantable by scripture, uncharitable and unjust to their fellow-servants in the Lord's vineyard, and totally untrue. Yet I have heard of all these ill names, and many more given to them, because they would say to these societies as they would say to any other self-constituted authority, when required to do what the word of God does not inculcate, "Who hath required this at your hands?" You know, sir, there is a marked and most important distinction to be made between the *intemperate*, the *temperate use*, and total abstinence from any of the gifts of Providence; and there are numerous things in the temperate use of which are real blessings, but in the intemperate use of them they become destructive evils. Are we to reject every thing of this nature?

I trust, sir, to your candor and impartiality for the insertion of this in your valuable Journal;—and believe me to remain yours, truly and faithfully in Christ, A CONSTANT READER.

Wilkesbarre, Aug. 8, 1831.

THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

THE writer of the following letter belongs to the Cumberland Prrsbyterians, a respectable sect in the lower country, standing on the round between Calvinism and Methodism. *Ed. M. H.*

"We copy the following curious account af a "revival" from the Religious and Literary Intelligencer, published at Princeton, Kentucky.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. Finnis Ewing, dated Ewingsville, Missouri, June 24, 1831.

Our summer's campaign against the works of darkness, and the "strong man armed," opened about two weeks since near this place, in a four days battle. The issue seemed quite doubtful for more than three days and nights! The officers, especially those in highest command, seemed to lack neither *skill* nor *courage*. Their sword appeared to be dexterously wielded; but most of the *soldiers*, for a time, seemed as if they had *lost* their armor. But the idea of essaying to fight the whole time without obtaining *one* victory, began to feel intolerable to both officers and soldiers. The result was, they all, or a great part part of them, looked beyond each other to the "Great Captain," sor *his* interposition, and simultaneously cried to him for the sake of his *own* honor, not to suffer the enemy to triumph. In *this* spirit they repaired to the battle ground. They set in front a young, though *nervous*, bold, courageous, and even daring officer. It was now a time of intense and indescribable terror. The *last struggle* was about to commence. More than a hundred hearts were saying, "O thou Great Captain! give signals to this young officer or come and fight thyself!" The young officer, however, unsheathed his sword, and seemed to be prepared to make a mighty onset, but, seeming more tenacious of the honor of his General than his own, he, too, just after he had drawn his sword, cried to the Captain General to come and fight and *he* should have the honor. Many soldiers and officers responded, and said, *Come!* The Great

Captain *did* come; the troops of the enemy began to tremble; their strong holds were stormed and taken; the "strong man armed" dispossessed—a good number of lawful captives taken—many more deeply, we hope, *mortally* wounded; and the officers and soldiers of the PRINCE much encouraged to enter the "tented field" again with fresh courage and renewed hopes of victory. But, brother, it is worthy of *special notice*, that the young officer was not engaged, perhaps, *five minutes*, before it was obvious to him—to all, that Prince Immanuel was doing his *own* work, consequently the young officer *desisted*. We are looking for still greater victories. May the God of armies harness us *all*—yes, *every one*, for the field, and *keep* our eye on the great Captain General."

MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

J M'Vay, Claysville, Pa. paid vols. 2 and 3 for A Biddle, and vol. 2 for C Biddle and himself. J W Fort, Denmark, Ten. vol. 2 for E Cross, B Hill, and 1 dollar for W Evans. W S Croxton, Tappahannock, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for R L Covington, G Taylor, and vol. 1 for R Dunn. J N Smith, Athens, Ala. vol. 2 for J Johnston and himself. L L Vall, Goshen, New York, vol. 2. A B Carns, Pikeville, Ten. vol. 2 for W D Carns. R R Price, Bolivar, Ala. vols. 1 and 2 for C D Roach, and 1 dollar on vol. 1 for R Price. W Hopper, Hopper's Tan Yard, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for T M Ewing, N Fox, A Shelton, B H Logan, W M Terry, W D Cope, D H Harrison, P Anderson, R Starks, J Solomon, R Mansfield, J Vance, H P Boyd, and vol. 1 for J Holland, M W Gillum, J Settle, J Cross, W Dodd, and vol. 2 for T J Hawks, D Edwins, and J Vaughn. J G Arnold, Covington, Ky. vols. 1 and 2. T W Jones, Lexington, Ky. vols. 1 and 2. A Adams, Haydensville, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for T W Taylor, vol. 1 for M Bourne, J Bernard, and vol. 2 for T Cross. E M'Gehee, Sandy River Church, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for W Walton. D Reed, Patterson, New Jersey, vols. 1 and 2 for J Kipp, J Duncan, A Adams, J Force, J Burden, and himself. L Zimmerman, Mount Pleasant, Pa. vol. 2. U M Roberts, King Creek, S. C. vol. 1 for J G Brown. J Groute, New Market, Upper Canada, vols. 1, 2, and 3. N Burrus, Elkton, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for G Waddell and G Key, vol. 1 for D R Merritt, J A Bailey, J Hill, and G Fristoe, and vol. 2 for J S Anderson, T Philips, G W Gordon, J W Sumsden, W Greenfield, and R Hatcher. B Major, Hopkinsville, Ky. vols. 1 and 2. J Westbrook, Rocky Mount, S. C. vols. 1 and 2 for J Westbrook and E Mayhew. D Hughes, Springfield, Ohio, vol. 2 for J Kelso, and vol 1, and $1 on vol. 2 for himself. W Thompson, Doneraile, Ky. vol. 2 for M Stone and J Neale. W Helm, Springfield, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for for J C Riley, W Glasscock, and J Bentley. L L Hamblin, Zanesville, Ohio, vol. 2. C Artzt, Pittsburg, Pa. vol. 1. E Mustain, Augusta, Ga. vol. 2 for R Philips, C Dickinson, and himself. M P Wheat, Columbia, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for J Smith, and vol. 2 for W Dudley, T M. Massy, Sen. J D Steel, and A Allen. H Green, Deatonville, Va. vol. 1 for E Green, and vol. 2 for himself. E Allen, Bedford, Ohio, vol. 2 for J Hubbet and himself, W Churchill, Randolph, Ohio, vol. 1 for F Upson, 1 Hargel, and vol. 2 for W Richards and J Miller. G Atkinson, Holliday's Cove, Va. vol. 2. L Spivey, Manchester, Va. vol. 2. H Carpenter, Thornsburg, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for C M'Calley, and vol. 2 for J M Anderson. J W Jeffreys, Jeffreys' Store, Va. vol. 2 for J M Jeter, H H Love, and 1 dollar for W Rowlett. M Ellis, Plum Orchard, Ind. vol. 2 for D Campbell, F Ellingwood, H Richardson, S Ellis, and himself. P L Thwnes, Office Tavern, Va. vol. 2 for A B Walthall, W Blanton, J B Hurt, B Bridgeforth, J C Foster, J Wood, T C Wilson, H Anderson, F Lawson, and T K Horner, P Haydenburg, Jacksonville, Ill. vol. 2 for A Brothers, Eads & Henry, A Davidson, E Davidson, and himself. R F Reeve, Minerva, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for B Harl. W T Mills, Somerville, Ten. vol. 1 for E B M'Coy, G Bowers, and M Lynch. W B Sims, Cuckooville, Va. vols. 1 and 2 for S W Allen, vol. 1 for W P Meriwether, J M Vest, and vol. 2 for N Walton. J Gaskill, New Lisbon, Ohio, $1 on vol. 2 for J Cownover. W D Carns, Pikeville, Ten. vol. 2 for P Sigler.

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

OF the seven christian churches of the Apocalypse, founded in Asia by the Apostles, hardly a vestige remains. Smyrna, Ephesus, Pergamos, Sardis, Thyatira, Laodicea, and Philadelphia, [see Rev. ii. and iii.] with all their power and magnificence, have fallen into utter decay; except that the first mentioned city remains a port of commercial consequence. But Ephesus is a mere heap of ruins. Pergamos has a population of 1500 Greeks, among 13,000 Turks. Sardis, once the splendid capital of Lydia, is a few mud huts. Thyatira, (now Ak-hissar) has only one miserable Greek church. Laodicea (now Eski-hissar) is a Turkish village, masses and scattered fragments of ancient architecture and sculpture. And Philadelphia (now Alah-Sher) has been shaken into dust by wars and earthquakes. *Reg. Herald.*

A QUERY.

TO what was the law added? Gal. iii. 18.

Answer—It was added to the promise or covenant concerning the Christ. The promise concerning the salvation of the Gentiles, or of blessing all men in the seed of Abraham—blessing them with remission of sins on earth, and an inheritance in heaven, of which Canaan was a type, constitute the covenant confirmed by God in relation to Christ; to which covenant, or promise, the law was added 430 years after; and which promise the law could not disannul because the inheritance was not through law, but through a promise anterior to, and independent of the law: for "God gave it to Abraham and his seed by promise." EDITOR.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

AN Essay on "the middle ground" people of Kentucky is omitted because too personal, and too much in the spirit of the Opposition. "*Josephus*" also is postponed, because we have in the Christian Baptist done enough of that sort of work. "*Flint*," from Virginia, has too much fire in it; and "*Martin Luther*," from Pennsylvania, is too much in the temper of the old Reformer. These correspondents are persons of good talents and information, but their late productions are at least *seven* years after date. The time was that such philippics were necessary, but now all that can be achieved by those means is gained. It is in the present reformation as in the different dispensations: Moses pronounced curses—Elijah called for fire from heaven—John the Baptist threatened an immersion in fire—Jesus once said, Sell your coat and buy a sword; but now, *Proclaim good news to the whole creation.* Our brethren will please continue their correspondence; but let it be in accordance with the progress of the reformation. Select edifying topics, and speak not so much of men and measures. Let us, brethren, reform as the reformation progresses; and if there be any flagellating or scalping to do, let it be reserved for capital offences. EDITOR.

☞AN ESSAY ON PRAYER, long since solicited, shall appear soon.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

No. 10. BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, OCTOBER* 3, 1831. Vol. II.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

THE LIBERALS;

OR,

SCEPTICAL PERSECUTIONS.

SCEPTICS of every name declaim against the intolerance of christian sects, and array before the world the various feuds, proscriptions, and persecutions, which ecclesiastical history records. They set off these dark blots in the escutcheons of sectarian christianity by the splendor of their professed liberality. They are the philosophers, the *liberals*, the free-thinkers, the charitable, and the tolerant; who would not hurt the wing of a fly for all the religion which is now or ever has been in the world. They have assumed so much charity, and so long boasted of liberality, that even the pleaders for religion and good morals seem disposed to concede to them an exemption from every thing intolerant, proscriptive, and persecuting. Some christian writers have even attempted to philosophize upon the charities of infidelity, and to account for its boasted liberality upon the principle of apathy or indifference to the whole concern of religion. What king or government would raise an army and levy contributions to wage war with another king or government for the right to pasture on the mountains of the Moon, or for liberty to shoot wild geese on the lakes and fens of Saturn? Who would load a cannon to break the wing of a moschetto?

But yet we are far from prepared to concede to scepticism, atheistical or deistical, any such liberality or charity as they claim. I believe the sceptics, as a class or a sect, are just as intolerant, proscriptive, and persecuting, as they have ever represented the most infatuated religionists in ancient or modern times. I say, we *believe* both Deists and Atheists to be just as intolerant and persecuting as ever were the Roman Catholics in the worst times of their history. But who can persecute when they are in a minority of one to a hundred or a thousand? We do not expect a serpent to sting us in winter, nor to meet a lion in Siberia. We do not fear the cockatrice' egg. Time must mature and develope every thing; and who can bite without an opportunity?

But let them have the ball at their own feet—let them have the sword in their own hands—and what could we expect? Philosophy or right reason decides the past for the future, or that which shall be must be learned from what has been. And what has been? Who shed the first christian blood? We ask not who made Socrates a martyr, but who made the first christian martyrs? Sceptics will reply, 'Infidel Jews.' But the Jews had no power to put any man to death without the Roman authority. Again: Who was it that made the blood of christians to run in rivers during the first ten persecutions? Atheists and Deists. It is a fact indisputable that countless myriads of christians were sacrificed by the sword of Pagan infidelity, of Roman atheism, deism, and polytheism.

And when had Sceptics power to persecute and did suffer it to sleep? Was it when France became infidel, philosophic, atheistical? Let the bloody scenes of the French Revolution speak out. Let the deeds of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, on the 2d and 3d of September, 1792—let the fate of the nonjuring priests and bishops of France tell the horrid tale. I say, let the sanguinary deeds of the adorers of Nature, in "the Reign of Terror," portray the generosity, magnanimity and tolerance of Scepticism.

I was led to make these remarks from the indications of the same spirit in the Atheists and Materialists of our times, from reading the narratives of sceptical insolence which are daily meeting our eyes from all corners of the land, and from abroad. Reader, ponder well the following extract from a late paper.—

"At the Rotunda, scenes of unparalleled performances are almost nightly going on. Mr. Taylor, the infidel, appears on a stage, over which is a mimic representation of the Holy Trinity, before which he bows and continues in the attitude of prayer for several minutes; then rises and bursts into a loud laugh. The scriptures are read, and comments the most profane and licentious made upon them: and, to crown all, bread and wine are brought on the stage, and this poor and wretched man comes forward and says, "I drink this in commemoration of Jesus Christ;" and the deluded and miserable multitude exclaim, "Well done! Bravo! Bravo!" This is a very brief and imperfect sketch of one night's exhibition."

This is the magnanimous liberality, the high-minded and honorable charity and regard for public sentiment—for the feelings of the most virtuous, benevolent, and useful part of an English community, to which these liberals aspire, and this is the liberty and tolerance for which they plead.

To mention a very humble name as exhibiting in bold relief the same intolerance and persecuting spirit, I would give a conspicuous niche in the temple of atheistic fame to Doctor Underhill of Ohio. The remarks made upon "Anatomy, a Cure for Religion," from the pen of this visionary materialist, in a former number of this work, drew from his sapient pen a pamphlet, *falsely* called, "*Campbell Refuted, being a Correspondence between the Rev. A. Campbell of Virginia, and* Dr. Samuel Underhill, *of Ohio, on the subject of the Debate held in Cincinnati, Ohio, between Robert Owen and Mr. Campbell, in April,* 1829." If a *note* declining any correspondence with this

"apostate preacher," as he defines himself, can be called "a *correspondence* on the subject of the debate," &c. according to Walker, Johnson, or Webster, then his title page tells the truth: but if otherwise, then it is as deceitful as his pretensions to reason. The *correspondence* is all on his side with the exception of said note, which appearing in his pamphlet, is from me a suitable and perfect answer to all he has written, and all he may hereafter write, on religion, morality, or common decency, as long as he may *vegetate* in this self-existent globe.

But I only bring him up at this time as a proof of my *allegata* against scepticism. I have some little experimental right to compare the persecuting and slandering spirit of sectaries and atheists, having been the object of both. And of all the barefaced falsehoods ever penned against me by partizan Doctors, in power or out of power with the people, this atheistic Doctor has published the greatest. His words are, "Since I learned the fact," (yes, reader, *the fact;* the Doctor goes for facts!) "of your selling a blind Negro child in the night, and refusing to make restitution, I have conceived you capable of any species of twistification." This is going as far as, and I presume a little farther, than our laws warrant in persecuting for conscience' sake. But I can well bear this after reading a few sentences before: "You can believe," says he, "of the Holy Ghost begetting a child on a virgin, and of that child cursing a fig-tree for not bearing figs in the winter, and sending six thousand devils into two thousand hogs." Such is the *English* language, decency, morality, logic, and love of fact adorning Doctor Samuel Underhill.

From history ancient and modern, from experience and observation, we are warranted to conclude that fatal, not only to the liberties, reputation, property, but to the lives of all non-conformists, would that day be which would give to atheism or scepticism the ascendant in any community. Christians cannot persecute; christians never did persecute. But bloody as have been some of the priests of sectarianisms, and slanderous as are the tongues and pens of schismatics in religion, when I have a choice offered me whether to fall into the hands of Priests or Atheists, I will not long hesitate to prefer the tender mercies of the former to those of the latter.

EDITOR.

CO-OPERATION OF CHURCHES.

NO. IV.

IN my first essay under this head it was alleged that the geographical and political boundaries of districts of country, were regarded in discriminating the co-operation of churches in the New Testament. "As I have given order to the *churches in Galatia*, so do you," says Paul to the church in Corinth. He also says *the churches in Macedonia* very liberally co-operated in their contributions for the poor saints in Judea. He speaks in the same epistle (2 Cor. 8th and 9th chaps.) of one person *chosen by the churches* to travel with him with the boun-

ty of the churches; and of others his companions, as *messengers of the churches.* It has been made sufficiently evident that the churches were distinguished by the political or geographical boundaries which enclosed them, and which must always, less or more, affect the circumstances and condition of all who live within them. It is soil, climate, and government, which create the most prominent diversities in the lot of individuals and churches. These are not arbitrary things, and must in their own nature, furnish incentives and reasons for co-operation.

Agreeably to the reason and nature of things, which must never be lost sight of, and to all that is said or implied in the New Testament, upon *this* subject, it behoves the churches at this time, to regard their location, as respects states and counties, in their efforts to convert the world.

Our political and territorial divisions, are counties and states.—The churches in each county should therefore, form an intimate acquaintance with one another, and co-operate first in all means necessary to the conversion of the county in which they are located, and of which they are a part. For example, the churches in this county of Brooke, now amounting to six, beside those on the line, partly in Brooke, Washington, Pa. and Ohio, Va. ought to unite their energies for the conversion of their fellow citizens. Those in Washington, Pa. and those in every other county, ought to do likewise.

We shall not now repeat what has been written, nor attempt again to demonstrate from scripture premises, that the Lord has left it now to the church to convert the world. He no longer employs Angels, Prophets, nor Apostles, as his agents in the work. He has fitted and furnished the church for this ministry. If they do their duty, the work of conversion goes on: if not, it stops.

The only question is, *how shall this be done to the best advantage?* The New Testament furnishes the principles which call forth our energies, but suggests no plan. This it could not have done, unless the geographical, political, pecuniary, and literary circumstances of every state, county, canton, or parish in all the world, and in all generations, had been located and described in the manner of an Universal Atlas, with directions varying with the soil, climate, government, trade, &c. &c. But, this would be as unnecessary as to have furnished us with a list of all the crimes to be avoided and all the virtues to be practised, which should, in after times, arise in the ever changing habits, circumstances, and relations of society. Hence, we do not think it necessary to find horseracing, cockfighting, bullbaiting, balls, cardplaying, and theatres, &c. &c. described and denounced in the New Testament, to enable us to condemn them—nor to find all the honest and virtuous trades, manners and customs, defined and enforced, in order to our practising them. But we find a *finally* in the New Testament, that justifies and condemns us, with as much point and perspicuity as a liturgy, a manual, or even a broad precept. "*Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, venerable, just, pure, benevolent, and of good fame, attentively consider and practise, and the God*

of peace will be with you." This, at the side of all goodness, and "*such like,*" at the side of a catalogue of vices, is enough for all virtue, and all vice.

The churches in every county, have from scripture and reason, all authority to bring their combined energies upon their own vicinity first, and when all is done at home, they may, and ought to co-operate with their weaker neighbors in the same state, and so on increasing the circle of their co-operations, as they fill up the interior, with all light and goodness, until the knowledge of the glory of the Lord cover the whole earth.

Whether then, they shall all meet annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, in one place in each county; or whether they shall appoint persons to visit all the churches in the same bounds, and to call forth all their means to enlighten and reform society at large, are questions which their own discretion must decide.

They may as rationally expect to find a law or rule on such subjects, in the New Testament, as to find a rule for the size and material of the house in which they ought to meet, and the hour of the day at which they shall commence or adjourn, and a hundred other things, purely circumstantial, which have no more faith nor morality in them than in the colors, blue, black, or brown.

Some weak, but honest minds, are for converting the New Testament into a *ritual,* and expecting to find a code of laws concerning every thing about economy, and co-operation, as if these were parts of christian faith and morals. Some have even thought it a sin to enumerate or enrol the names of the members of one congregation, because David was punished for enumerating Israel and Judah; and because others have written down articles of belief, and bound them on the consciences of men, they are afraid to write down their own *names;* or to ascertain how many members compose the church of any one place. Such eccentricities of mind, resemble the conduct of a man who, because his father was drowned, would not pass a shallow ford, and of another, who, because he had been burned when a child, would never approach a fire to warm by it.

We have neither Achaia, Macedonia, Galatia, Philippi, nor Thessalonica in these United States; but we have Pennsylvania, Virginia and Ohio, and we have the counties of Brooke, Ohio, Trumbull, Portage and Jefferson; and all the reason in the world why churches in these districts should know one another as well, and co-operate as fully now, as in the times of the Apostles.

The churches must awake and arise from their supineness in the Lord's work. Only let them think what they might do and how little they are doing.—To begin at home, I shall take this our county of Brooke, for an example. In it there are, say, five hundred disciples, free men in the kingdom of the Messiah. Suppose then, that besides the weekly meetings of these brethren, in their respective churches on every Lord's day for all the purposes of social and christian worship; suppose they had one general meeting, as central as possible in the county, say annually; at which meeting reports were made of the

moral condition of every vicinity in the county, and that they should agree to select some seven or fourteen stations in the county, to be supplied once every week by some member of these communities, as their agent, whose qualifications will enable him to proclaim reformation towards God and faith in Jesus Christ—who is accomplished to proclaim reformation and forgiveness of sins in such a way as to interest and edify the hearers. One such person might once in each week, visit these seven stations, or in two weeks fourteen stations, covering almost the whole population of the county. Suppose then he labored thus for one year, and made report at the next annual meeting, of his progress, and that the brethren of these congregations supplied him with every thing necessary to life and godliness, what would be the probable result? what would be the tendency of such an arrangement? All the churches in the county, meeting every Lord's day to worship the Lord and to build up one another in faith, hope and love, and to pray for the conversion of their neighbors, for the success of this their agent, whom they patronize, would be, one would think, more likely to diffuse the influences of the gospel through society in one year, than all that is now done in two or three. And can the churches not scripturally, rationally, and honorably co-operate in such an effort to serve the community! Are they not able to find such a person, and cannot 300 disciples labor each one day in the year, to supply him who for them labors 365 days in the year, in proclaiming the word!!

Let the churches in Brooke provoke to emulation and arouse to jealousy, the churches of Trumbull in Ohio; and let the churches in Trumbull, provoke to emulation the churches in Portage, and so on till the praises of the Lord resound from thousands of tongues, which are now mutes in the moral creation. A co-operation of this kind, is worth all the speculations of the day on regeneration, faith and repentance. And indeed, we are at a loss to know how christians can rest contented, while so many of their neighbors, friends and relatives are living without God and without hope in the world. Can they be content to see their own flesh and blood perishing in their sins and not make a single effort—neither devote a day in the year, nor the value of it, to the salvation of their fellow men? We presume it is because the matter is not reflected on, and because some are yet waiting for a law, commandment, or voice from God, authorizing them to exhort and beseech their fellow men to be reconciled to God through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. Let the disciples every where, take this great matter into their most serious consideration, and not only pray the Lord to send forth laborers into the harvest, but thrust in their sickles into the ripe grain. EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger,

NO. II.

IN my last communication of extracts from Ecclesiastical History, I withheld the name of the author, in order that your readers may not be influenced by *names*, but by *principles*. The language of the

author, proves himself a man of principles. He wrote upwards of one hundred years ago—then belonging to a sect now in existence, who are yet in Babylon. Let us hear him again:—

"Though the controversies amongst christians be very sharp, and managed with great heat and animosity, so that we may hear complaints made on all sides, of very obvious things being denied by some of the contending parties; yet, notwithstanding, there are some things so evident, that they are all agreed in them. And it is no mean argument of the truth of such, that they are received by the common consent of those who are most set upon contention, and most blinded by passion. I do not mean by this, that all other things about which there is any contention, are doubtful or obscure, because all christians are not agreed in them. It may easily happen that that may be obscure to some, which would be very plain, if they were not blinded by passion; but it is hardly possible that the fiercest adversaries, who are most eager in disputing, should agree about an obscure point."

"First then, all christians now alive, are *agreed concerning the number and truth of the books of the New Testament;* and though there be some small controversy amongst learned men about some Epistles of the Apostles, this is no great matter; for they all acknowledge that there is nothing but truth contained in them, and that the christian doctrine is not at all altered, either by keeping or rejecting them. And this consent is of no small moment in a debate about the undoubted original of divine revelation, if all that have been preserved according to the opinions of some, are called in question by others."

"Further, christians are agreed in many articles of faith which they embrace as things to be believed, practised, and hoped for. For instance, all who have any understanding (of the scriptures,) believe. (I shall mention only the principal heads here.) 1. That there is one God, eternal, all-powerful, infinitely good and holy; in a word, endued with all the most excellent attributes, without the least mixture of imperfection; that the world and all things contained in it, and consequently mankind were created by the same God; and that by him all things are governed and directed with the highest wisdom. 2. That *Jesus Christ* is the only Son of the same God; that he was born at Bethlehem of the Virgin Mary, without the knowledge of man, in the latter part of the life of Herod the Great, in the reign of *Augustus Cæsar*, that he was afterwards crucified, and died in the reign of *Tiberius*, when *Pontius Pilate* was Governor of *Judea;* that his life is truly related in the history of the gospel; that he was therefore sent from the Father, that he might teach men the way to salvation, redeem them from their sin, and reconcile them to God by his death; and that this his mission was cofirmed by innumerable miracles; that he died as I before said, and rose again, and after he had been very often seen by many who had discoursed with him and handled him, he was taken up into heaven where he now reigns, and from whence he will one day return to pass a final judgment according to the laws of the

gospel, upon those who are then alive, and upon all them that are dead, when they shall be raised out of their graves; that all these things he taught to be believed, and all that he commanded are to be obeyed, whether they relate to the worship of God, or to temperance in restraining our passions, or to charity exercised towards others; that nothing could be appointed more holy, more excellent, more advantageous and more agreeable to human nature, than these precepts; however, that all men (Jesus only excepted) violate them, and cannot arrive at salvation but through the mercy of God. 3. That there is a Holy Spirit, who inspired the Apostles of Jesus Christ, worked miracles to recommend them, and inclines the minds of PIOUS men constantly to OBEY God, and SUPPORTS them in the AFFLICTIONS of life; that we are to give the same credit, and in ALL THINGS TO OBEY *this Spirit speaking by the Apostles, as we do the Father and the Son.* 4. That the christian church owes its ORIGIN and preservation from the days of Christ to this time, to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that all they who believe these things and OBSERVE the PRECEPTS *of the gospel*, shall obtain mercy of God, whereby they shall be made partakers of the resurrection (if they be dead when Christ shall come) and of a happy life to eternity; on the contrary, all they who have DIMINISHED *from the faith of the gospel and have not* OBSERVED its PRECEPTS, shall rise (if they be dead) to be punished, and their punishment shall be eternal death. 5. Lastly, *that christians ought to profess all these things, both at their* BAPTISM, in which we declare that we will *lead a life free from the filthiness of iniquity, according to the direction of the gospel;* and also at the Lord's Supper, in which we celebrate the death of Christ, according to his command, till he comes; and show that we are willing to be esteemed his disciples, and the brethren of all those who celebrate it in like manner; moreover, *that those rites, if they are observed by us as is reasonable*, and are celebrated with a *religious mind*, CONVEY HEAVENLY GRACE AND THE DIVINE SPIRIT TO US."

"These things, and others that are necessarily connected with them, (for it is not to our present purpose to mention them all particularly,) all christians believe; nor is there any other difference but only this, that *some add many other things to these*, whereby they think the foregoing doctrines ought to be *explained* or *enlarged with additions;* and these such as they imagined were delivered to posterity, *not by the writings of the Apostles*, but by the *tradition and custom of the church, or by the writings of latter ages.* Concerning these additions, I shall say nothing more than that I before advised, that christians are not agreed upon them, as they are upon the doctrines now *explained, which are put beyond all manner of doubt by their own plainness, if we allow but the authority of the Holy Scriptures, which no christian, in his sense can refuse.*"

"In this agreement and disagreement amongst christians, prudent men will judge it most safe *to take their knowledge of the christian religion from the fountain*, which is not in the least suspected, and whose streams, *all confess to be pure and undefiled.* And *this four*

tain, is not the creed or the confession of faith of any particular church, but *only the* BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, *which all acknowledge to be genuine*. I confess some christians do sometimes say, that those books cannot be understood, but the doctrine of their church; but others again deny it; and (to mention but this one thing) that *opinion is very suspicious, that depends only on the testimony of those that affirm it, and they, such whose chief interest it is that it should seem true.* Others say, that there is need of the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit, not only in order to the belief of the scriptures, (which may *without any great difficulty*, be allowed,*) but also to understand the meaning of the words contained in it; which I DO NOT SEE HOW IT CAN BE PROVED; but we will grant this also, provided they will acknowledge that ALL MEN, *who read the books of the New Testament with a* RELIGIOUS MIND, INTENT UPON TRUTH, are afforded this spirit by the goodness of God; there is no need for any thing more than this. *Every one, therefore, may wisely and safely gather his knowledge of the christian religion from these books.*"

"Whosoever, therefore, believes that the revelation of the will of God made by Christ, is faithfully related in the books of the New Testament; such an one must of necessity embrace all things which he there meets with, according as he understands them, as matters of faith, practice and hope; for whoever believes in Christ ought to receive with a religious mind, every thing which he thinks comes from him; he cannot defend himself with any excuse, whereby to admit some, and reject others of those things which he acknowledges comes from Christ. And such are all those doctrines I before explained, and concerning which all christians, as I said are, agreed."

T. M. H.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

KING AND QUEEN, VA.

OF FAITH AND REMISSION OF SINS.

WHILE a spirit of inquiry continues among professors of religion, we may rationally conclude that we are neither absorbed by indolent luke-warmness, nor yet so highminded as to say "we are rich, and have need of nothing." Truly, this is an interesting time; we see a great deal of running to and fro in the world, an apparent disposition to get and to give help. And some are by some means or other set up a little above others, we are told, for the express purpose of helping the many; and among this smaller number, I happen to find myself classed. But so unfortunately discordant am I with the greater number of my class, so exceedingly heterodox, that we get along but *unevenly* together, to make the best of it. And yet, strange as it may appear, the leading principles avowed by us are almost common; for instance, they profess to be called to the work of the ministry, and so do I—they say that the word of God is their rule of faith and man-

*These things are granted to bring about a union among christians, but the writer requires that they should grant that these things are obtained by the use of means.

ners, [ought they not to add the word ONLY, here?] so do I—that all practical exhibitions claiming to be godliness, must be tried and judged by this rule; so do I—that nothing can be exacted of a man, either in or out of the church, beyond what is thus written, and so do I.—Yet after all, we fall out by the way, and often speak evil of each other, and clearly prove to the world that we are not quite as well reconciled to each other, as we are to a wicked world itself. Is not this nearly as bad as to have bitter and sweet water to come from the same fountain? But while we are contending for the truth, if we must need be at some variance, we ought still to recollect that God is over all, and that the *sole* government happens not to be ours; that we are but subordinate agents, and figuring but a few degrees above puppets, often in their very character, without knowing it, (as your writer is actually supposed by some to be) and should never transcend the limits of sound argument and *persuasive measures*, leaving the rest to time and to God. But I must return from my wandering, and as I proposed, cast my mite into the common treasury, upon the subjects of Faith, and Forgiveness of Sins. I shall endeavor to be concise on this occasion, so as to fix more particularly the attention of the reader upon the two old subjects before him.

My object in associating faith and forgiveness of sins here is, to point out simply the source of what appears to me to be an erroneous impression of very general prevalence, and so aid those who are desirous of keeping the economy of God in its purity, in the accomplishment of this laudable desire. The world, the christain world, has long entertained the impression, that when an individual exercised faith of the whole heart, commonly called saving faith, *his or her sins were at that moment blotted out;* and the confirmation of this opinion, (for it is nothing but an opinion) is formed, we are told, in the pleasurable enjoyment and unspeakable happiness of many of those who so believe. Let us weigh this matter fairly. And here permit me to point to what appears evidently a mistake in thousands of those who embrace the christian religion under such previous impression. In a state of high mental excitement, we will suppose a young man of sanguine temperament, to be deeply convicted of his lost condition, that without an interest in the blood of Christ, his sins cannot be blotted out, nor his soul saved;—of these things he feels persuaded; his mind exercising but feeble faith, (but not even recognized by him as such) is mainly brooding over the enormity of his transgressions; his desire is heavenward, and his cry to God is, that for *Christ's* sake he will have mercy upon him.—He waits upon God not only with his petitions and desires, but in meditation and the use of his words; by the natural operation of which means, the mustard seed of faith increases, or to add another figure, that which was but a little water in his soul, springs and springs until its abundance becomes a full supply, out of which he is enabled with enraptured delight to claim Jesus for his own, "the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely;" he rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory! But ask him to tell you why he thus rejoices, and he will not hesitate to declare that

his sins are pardoned! instead of, that he has found a Saviour who is able to save him! The mind fixes upon that which seems not to be authorized by revelation, but the mere result of education, and becomes not unfrequently utterly paralyzed in its operation, and subjects its victim to long, and not unfrequently to gross and endless *disobedience* to the wise and merciful government of God.

But one will urge as an objection—I *felt*, and consequently *know* that my sins were pardoned at such a moment. And here I meet a host: but let me answer. God has given us an infallible rule which shall neither be altered nor amended; no, not so much as by the best feeling of his best saint, for even to such he said, "if any man add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book." And though we are willing to give to feeling its proper place, we cannot consent to elevate it to the seat of an infallible revelation; while we look upon its influence as the luxuries of the rich desert, we cannot agree to forego the benefits of the more substantial blessings of life; the *meat* and *bread* of God's word make us to grow and thrive, and to become men and women in the Lord, while these delicacies render us voluptuous, and nothing better than mere *dyspeptics* in religion, always craving high-toned feelings, well spiced systematic productions, et cetera. But to the point again. By a mere abstract sensation of the soul or spirit, a man cannot *certainly* tell what his conclusions concerning it ought to be, whether favorable or unfavorable, and therefore must seek aid of contingencies of some sort, which frequently prove such efficient auxiliaries as to aid him most happily in arriving at correct conclusions upon sensations.

In religion, there are two auxiliaries, and only two, which can be called in to the aid of man, in directing him as to his feelings: and these are, the *direct teachings of the Holy Spirit*, and the *written word of God*. The first has long ago been withdrawn, and it is to the last only, that we must appeal for instruction upon the subject of religion. Should we not be willing to appeal to so holy an umpire? By it we must stand or fall—it is our *holy law of liberty*, just and true, reaching every case. What saith it in its sublime unbroken connexion? Does it teach a sinner, that when he believes, his sins are blotted out? Does it teach that when sinners have obeyed the commands to believe, repent, and reform, that they are then in the kingdom of God's dear Son? We cannot think so, for then we distinctly find two sorts of kingdoms on earth,-one to be entered *without*, and the other to be entered *by water*. But Jesus saith, "verily, verily, I say unto thee, unless a man be *born of water and spirit*, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." When several acts of a legislature touch the same subject, the highest is to be considered the final and obligatory rule of action. Christ here gives us the highest decree within his government; adds it to the "eleven" on the mountain in Galilee, and hands down to us by the inspired historian, its practical illustration on the day of Pentecost. Other instances are also recorded.

But again, the allusion here is most natural and easy in another

particular. "My burden is gone," replies the objector. Your burden was not a physical one, either of brick or stone, but consisted in a mental conviction of right and wrong; to you an unusual view of God's word and ways, and corresponding effects. Were you not a sinner before the commencement of this state of things? But you did not know it, because your attention was mainly directed to other things; in short, your state was one of awful deception; the God of this world had blinded your eyes. Now, why may not this be the case again? You behold Jesus, whose very name signifies Saviour, his fulness is complete—your wants are urgent,—through the eye of faith, the rich fulness of redemption rushes into the inmost recesses of the soul. Jesus is announced, and to all the affections of the bosom, as the most worthy of all beings,—a wide spread invitation pervades and absorbs every faculty as well as passion, and in the fulness of the ecstasy of love and gratitude, you forget the inquiry, "Lord what wouldst thou have me to do?" *imagining that all is now done!* Like the prisoner in his loathsome chains and dungeon, who perceives his deliverer approaching; he forgets for a moment his miseries, absorbed by love, gratitude and the prospect before him: but he must *arise* and *follow* his benefactor, if he would enjoy the communication of his design. Though he might be blessed with things to which he had been long and even a stranger, in his dungeon, still a change of state must be realized, before the true blessings of light and liberty could be conferred.

Again: Faith is an action of the mind, and communicates to the soul, sensations corresponding with the objects embraced. Hence our happiness in believing in the Saviour, and in many other good things, and our misery in believing in evil things. While faith is one of the most powerful and common principles existing, it not unfrequently misleads us grossly. But it stands justly at the head of christian principles, for "without it, it is impossible to please God."

Once more, and I have done. The *forgiveness of sins*, has been looked upon as always connected with a corresponding *sensation of the inward man*. Fairly considered and intelligibly viewed, a corresponding sensation, I would say, ought to be enjoyed, but not always of the description generally contemplated. It should be of the cast of enjoyment realized by the dutiful son who faithfully performs the service imposed by a kind parent. But *forgiveness of sins is in the bosom of God, and in Heaven from his throne*, when Jesus maketh intercession for us. And unless it was to be communicated by an intelligible voice, or some acts or sign addressed to the eye, according to an instituted plan, we should be in perpetual uncertainty. It is by the last named plan, that we learn it. An outward act and sign is constituted the source, the legal source of confidence to us, in the most striking manner. *The act of faith*, on man's part, is constituted the *act of pardon* on God's part. According to reason and revelation, a faithful obedience in submitting to immersion, appears essential to the forgiveness of sins. I must not say more at present, though I have only laid the premises. JOHN.

GENERAL MEETING IN NEW LISBON.

THE congregations composing the Mahoning Association, which, as an ecclesiastical tribunal, dissolved itself last year, met in New Lisbon on Friday, the 25th, and continued till the evening of the 28th August. A goodly number of disciples from most of these congregations met. Friday evening was occupied chiefly in prayer and praise. Saturday forenoon was spent in hearing reports from those who labored in the word and teaching. Brother *William Haden* was the only person who labored nearly all the year. By "labor in the word," we mean devoting the whole time to proclaiming reformation and remission. He spoke sometimes forty times in one month, and immersed in ten months about one hundred persons. Other brethren labored as much as health and circumstances would permit, and with good success. Brother *Secrest*, who has been travelling for the last two or three years in Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and the Michigan territory, also attended this meeting. He gave some very interesting details of the various success attendant on his travels. His baptisms averaged about *twenty-five per month*, including the labors of some brother who generally attended him. Reports from all quarters assured us that the gospel, if proclaimed in simplicity, and without human definitions and appendages, would soon gain the ascendancy over all humanisms, and be as efficacious in purifying the hearts and in reforming the manners of men as in the days of old.

From all the reports made in this meeting, it appeared that about five hundred persons were immersed during the last year by the different laborers who generally attend that meeting.

On Saturday afternoon brother *Scott* addressed a large audience on the christian's reason of hope.

On Lord's day, after some five or six hundred disciples had celebrated the Lord's death, a discourse was delivered by the writer of this article on the christian's relations and character; after which several exhortations were tendered to the congregation. During the meeting eight persons were immersed. On our return home brother *Scott* and myself held a meeting on the waters of King's Creek, Va. at which ten persons obeyed the gospel.

The most important item which occupied the attention of the meeting was a proposition to adopt some plan of co-operation among the churches in spreading the gospel. A committee was appointed to digest the outlines of a plan proposed in the meeting. On Saturday evening they reported as follows:—

The brethren to whom was referred the consideration of *the ways and means* most conducive to the co-operation of the congregations in the promotion of the interests of the kingdom of our Lord, beg leave to REPORT—

That, as the Saviour has left the conversion of the world to the citizens of his kingdom, we deem it most expedient, in the present crisis,

to suggest to the brethren the necessity and importance of co-operation, and to take into consideration whether the following arrangement might not be submitted to the disciples in the different congregations for their concurrence and adoption.

1. That the churches in each county, (say, for example, in Columbiana, Trumbull, Portage, and Geauga,) and all who publicly labor in the word and teaching, should meet annually in one central place for worship and edification, and to consult on the best means of promoting the cause in each county.

[The second resolution being agreed to for only one meeting, until the brethren shall have finally acted upon the plan suggested, we shall leave it out, only so far as to state, that it was agreed that as many of the disciples residing in these counties as can assemble, shall meet next year on the Friday before the fourth Lord's day of August, in Randolf, Portage county; to continue for four days, or till Monday evening, for worship and public edification, and for co-operation in the ways and means for furthering the gospel.]

3. That these county meetings shall have nothing to do with any church business, of any sort whatever: but shall spend the time in public worship and edification, in hearing reports from the churches, and those who labor in the word, of the success attendant on their operations, and to devise *ways and means* for giving greater publicity to the word in such places as may require their particular attention.

4. This arrangement is simply suggested to the consideration of the brethren, to be adopted, continued, or discontinued, as experience may dictate. But as experience is the great teacher of expediency, we would recommend that the experiment may be made, and that thus, until a better arrangement be discovered, correspondence between the brethren be kept up, and information on all subjects of general interest be communicated and received.

The above REPORT was agreed to; or, in other words, the disciples who were present agreed very unanimously to recommend to the consideration of the churches the plan of co-operation above sketched; and if agreed to by the brethren, it is expected before the next meeting in Randolf, that the congregations in each county will have held one meeting and have ascertained how much is lacking to be done, and how much they can do to further the gospel among themselves.

Many advantages will result from this plan if carried out; and if any disadvantages attend it, so soon as discovered they may be remedied. It has nothing to do with either faith or morals, or with the internal concerns of congregations. Its whole and sole object is to concentrate the energies of the brethren in converting the community among which the Lord has cast their lot.

EDITOR

For the Millennial Harbinger.

A COMPARISON
BETWEEN HUMAN AND DIVINE LAWS.

IT is not my intention, at present, to prove that God has spoken to man, but simply to draw a comparison between human and divine laws. The oracles of God, with which the Jews were entrusted, are frequently called the law. (See Rom. iii. 2; Ps. xix. 7; John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25; Rom. ii. 17, 20, iii. 19, 21.) "In all which places the law signifies the whole of the divine revelations, taken complexly as they stand recorded in the Jewish scriptures."

The gospel is sometimes called the law, 1 Cor. vii. 39. James says, there is one Law-giver, (meaning Christ) who is able to save and destroy, iv. 12. The law of Christ, 1 Cor. ix. 21.—The law of liberty, James i. 25. The word law, then, in this extended sense, comprehends both the Jewish and Christian scriptures, and in this sense we shall use it in this essay.

What is the first requisite in human laws? Answer; Plainness. All legislators, ancient and modern, who have published laws, have published them so plainly that the most simple person, who could read them, or hear them read, could comprehend the meaning of the language used by them. It would be iniquitous, cruel, and unjust, on the part of any earthly legislator, to publish laws in a dead or foreign language, or to use ambiguous, dark, indefinite, and unintelligible words, and then punish his subjects for disobeying laws which they had no means of understanding. So has God published his laws plainly. Simplicity is the characteristic of his laws. He spoke plainly to Adam in the garden, Do not touch this tree, Adam; He spoke plainly to the antediluvians, Come into the ark prepared by Noah, the flood is coming—if you do not enter this ark, you will all be drowned. Paul says that there is great plainness of speech used under the gospel. God used such language as this to Moses and the Jews: For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not *hidden* from thee, neither is it far off, or hard to be understood—Deut. xxx. 2. At the end of every seven years, in the feast of tabernacles, Moses was commanded to gather together men, women, children, and strangers, and read the law to them, for the following reasons: 1st, that even the children might hear the laws; 2d, that they might learn them; 3d, that they might fear the Lord their God, the author of these laws; 4th, that they might observe TO DO all the words of this law. Here God presumed that he had made his laws so plain that children born between these feasts, held every seven years, could understand these laws, and that they could obey or do them without one prior or calvinistic operation upon them.

According to the popular teaching, God is inferior to all earthly legislators—he has published laws which it is impossible for men to comprehend until they get a second revelation. His oracles are more dark and ambiguous than the heathen oracles; after he speaks once, we must wait for a second oracle, or illumination, to explain the

first, a third to explain the second, and so on *ad infinitum*, or without end. "This is sound doctrine."

In opposition to the sound doctrine of mysticism, ambiguity, and unintelligibility of the scriptures, God says by the mouth of his prophet Isaiah, chap. xlv. 19, "I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth; I am Jehovah who speak truth; who give direct answers." In opposition to the manner in which the heathen oracles gave their answers, which were generally delivered from some deep and obscure cavern, God says, "I have not spoken in secret," &c. Such were the answers returned by the Cumanean Sybil. Such was the famous oracle at Delphi. Virgil says, "*Excisum Cubaicæ latus ingens rupis in antrum.*" Strabo says, "the oracle is said to be a hollow cavern, of a considerable depth, with an opening not very wide. In this chasm, or cleft in the earth, was situated what was called the Adytum of the temple. Adytum means a cavern, or the hidden part of the temple.

If our position respecting the plainness of the scriptures be correct, what becomes of mysticism, and all the speculations about the meaning of baptism by immersion, by sprinkling, pouring, &c.? If the scriptures are not plain, then God is inferior to all human legislators —then the scriptures are no better than heathen oracles—then God is deficient in wisdom or benevolence: for if he is wise enough to make them plain, and has not done it, then he is deficient in benevolence; if he is benevolent enough to do it, and has not done it, then he is deficient in wisdom; so that whichever horn of the dilemma the mysticisers seize, their system is done. If the scriptures be plain, their system is cut up; if they are not plain, then all the above absurd consequences unavoidably follow. So much for our first position, that all laws, human and divine, are, or should be, plain. This is the first requisite of law. If any thing more was necessary to establish this position, we might add, that all human laws are published in the vulgar tongue of the people who are the subjects of the laws—God published his laws to the Jews in their vernacular tongue —the gospel was published in the Greek, or universal language of that age. The scriptures were to be publicly read when the christians assembled, which is another proof that God designed they should understand them, otherwise it would have been a gross insult to their intellect. Masters, and fathers, and military commanders, and all who are in authority, must speak plainly, or they are cruel tyrants. Our next position is, that no benevolent, wise, or just legislator, ever required his subjects to perform impossibilities—works or actions which were beyond the reach of human agency to accomplish, which none but angels or giants could perform. It is true that Pharoah required the Israelites to make brick without straw—Potiphar threw Joseph into prison unjustly—Nebuchadnezzar required Daniel to find out his own dreams, and then tell the interpretation; but he was not just, nor wise. God is a just, wise, and benevolent Lawgiver; therefore he never acted like Pharoah, nor Nebuchadnezzar. He required no more of Adam than he could do; no more of the Patriarchs, no

more of the whole Jewish nation than they could do, which was to believe him, and observe his commands. What God requires of us under the gospel is, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another as he gave us commandment. This has been done, and can be done again.

In support of the position that we can do all that God requires of us, which is to believe him and obey his commands, I would observe, that the most eminent saints, under both Testaments, are commended for doing this much, to wit: Noah, Enoch, Abraham, David, Job; and all who did not obey him were punished for it, which would have been unjust if more had been required of them than they could perform. God is not unjust, nor did he ever require impossibilities. So much for our second position respecting the equity of divine laws. If these two positions be incontrovertible, they subvert and demolish the two main pillars in the popular doctrine, first, that the scriptures are dark to the natural or unregenerate man; secondly, that men cannot believe nor obey God until regenerated by prior and antecedent, physical and extra operations of the popular Spirits.

Our third position is, that all human laws are or should be published to ALL the subjects of the commonwealth, or realm, and not to a part only. The reason and justice of this is, that it would be iniquitous and unreasonable to publish laws openly to a part of the subjects of the laws, and conceal them from others who were equally interested, and who were to be judged by them. We should bear in mind, that the scriptures were not written for ourselves alone, but for all the nations of the world; for people of the most diverse climates, characters, and habits: and if some parts appear comparatively useless to us, we are not therefore to infer that there are no human beings to whom they may be useful; for are we the standard of the whole world? and must God make the whole human race after our model? The Bible was not originally addressed to us, but to the people of the East; and to their habits, feelings, and modes of thoughts is its costume conformed, and not to ours. Let these things be remembered, and let us read the Bible as men ought to read a book addressed to their common sense, *and not designed for themselves only, but for all their race.* So much, then, for the position that all human laws should be published universally, not partially, nor clandestinely, but publicly. But some person will object, that the Bible is nothing but lampblack and paper, bound with sheep-skin. And what are human laws but lampblack and paper? Yet the power of life and death are in them. It is not the "lampblack and paper" that saves or destroys the man, but the truths expressed in the words; it is the authority impressed upon the laws; it is the highest authority and obligation that has been disobeyed, trampled upon and abused, that subjects the disobedient to punishment. What are the laws of this, and all other modern governments, but "lampblack and paper"? yet we have witnessed their *force* upon criminals. But the popular clergy tell the people they cannot believe, although God has commanded it. The following pertinent supposition will illustrate their

mode of preaching: "Suppose, for a moment, twelve discreet, intelligent men, taken from their congregations, and empannelled to try a cause in a court of justice, in which the whole evidence is written, and of record. The lawyer who has truth on his side, after hinting at the evidence, commences his address to the jury. He very gravely tells them that, owing to their natural weakness, ignorance, and 'total depravity,' they cannot possibly believe that his client has truth and justice on his side; that it is very true that they have evidence enough before them to convince them that he has justice on his side, and that the evidence is written, and of the very best sort—but because it is written, therefore they cannot believe the things which it proves; and that, in order to their belief of the lampblack and paper, it is necessary that the facts recorded be either acted over before their faces, which is not to be expected, or that they must have an immediate inspiration to prove them, or to impress upon their minds the truth of the case. After this orthodox introduction, (which they believe upon "*his* bare word," without any operation or evidence,) the lawyer proceeds to entreat the jury to believe that his client has truth on his side, and that his cause is a just one, and then finishes his speech by telling them that if they do not so determine he will send every one of them to Satan. After the trial is over, he asserts that those who believed what he told them were influenced and illuminated by divine inspiration, and that he himself had spoken to them by a special call to plead law; and that those who did not believe him were influenced in their decisions by a divine decree." This case represents the preaching of the moderns, which is productive of so little effect, which mode of preaching is the reason that so few of mankind pretend to believe in the gospel, while a majority of those who do adopt the same notions and imaginations about the immediate operations which their lawyer preachers have instilled into them. The present generation will not be able to believe the gospel on its own 'intrinsic evidence;' their minds are too much vitiated with the popular dogmas of the age. How can men believe who court honor, one of another, and the honors of orthodoxy, and of 'sitting in council,' and of your associated capacity'? These men are as proud of a pair of saddlebags hung upon their arm, and of 'sitting in councils,' as the politicians are of sitting in the State Legislatures and Congress. Advisory councils are founded *in* and addressed *to* the pride and ambition of men, two powerful passions when whetted by popular superstition. HUGO GROTIUS.

THE WILL OF JOHN CALVIN.

IN the name of God. To all whom it may concern: be it known that in the year 1564, and on the 25th day of the month of April, I, Pierre Chenelat, citizen and sworn notary of Geneva, having been called in by John Calvin, minister of the word of God, in the church of Geneva, and citizen of the said Geneva; who, being indisposed in body, but of sound and disposing mind, hath declared to me his wish to make his last will and testament: desiring me to write what he should dictate and pronounce; which at his said request I have done, and written what he hath dictated to me, and pronounced word by word,

without omitting or adding any thing thereto, according to what followeth:—

—"In the name of God, I, John Calvin, minister of the word of God, in the church of Geneva, finding myself so much reduced by various maladies, that I cannot but think that God will shortly remove me out of this world, have ordered to be made and written my testament, and declaration of my last will, in form and manner following:—

"First, I give thanks to God, that, taking pity on me, whom he hath created and placed in this world, he hath delivered me out of the thick darkness of idolatry, into which I was plunged; and hath brought me into the light of his gospel, and made me a partaker of the doctrine of salvation, whereof I was most unworthy. And he hath not only gently and graciously borne with my faults and sins, for which I deserved to be rejected of him and cast out, but hath vouchsafed to use my labors in preaching and publishing the truth of his gospel. And I declare it is my wish and intention to continue in the same faith and religion, having no other hope or refuge but in his gratuitous adoption of me, upon which is founded all my salvation: embracing the grace which he has given me in Jesus Christ, and accepting the merit of his death and passion, that so all my sins may be buried; and beseeching him so to wash and cleanse me in the blood of that great Redeemer which was shed for all poor sinners, that in his image I may appear before his face. I declare also, that, according to the measure of grace bestowed upon me, I have endeavored to teach his word in its purity, as well in sermons as in writings, and endeavored faithfully to expound the Holy Scriptures; and that in all the disputes which I have had with the enemies of truth, I have never used either craftiness or sophistry, but have fairly maintained the truth. But, alas! my zeal, if it deserve the name, has been so cold and unworthy, that I feel myself highly indebted in all, and through all: and if it were not for his infinite bounty, all the zeal I have discovered would appear light as smoke, and the graces which he has bestowed upon me would only render me more guilty; so that my only refuge is, that He being the Father of mercy, I trust he will be and appear the Father of so miserable a sinner. Further, I desire that my body, after my decease, may be interred in the customary manner, awaiting the day of a blessed resurrection. With respect to the property which God hath given me to dispose of, I name and appoint as my only heir, my well-beloved brother Anthony Calvin; nominally leaving to him only the cup which I received from Monsieur de Varennes, begging him to be content therewith, which I am persuaded he will be; knowing that I have no other motive than that what little I leave may descend to his children. Further, I leave to the college ten crowns, and to the purse for poor strangers, the same sum. Also, to Jane, the daughter of Charles Castan, and of my half sister on the paternal side, the sum of ten crowns. Further, to Samuel and to John, sons of my said brother, my nephews, each forty crowns. And to my nieces, Ann, Susanna, and Dorothy, each thirty crowns. As to my nephew David, as he hath proved but light and trifling, I bequeath to him only twenty crowns, for chastisement. This is in sum, all the property which God hath given me, as far as I am able to ascertain it, in books, furniture, and other things. Should it, however, prove more, I desire it may be distributed between my nephews and nieces aforesaid, not excluding my nephew David, should God give him grace to be more circumspect. But I believe that with respect to this, there will be no difficulty, especially when my debts are paid, which I have given in charge to my brother, upon whom I can depend; naming him executor of this testament, with Laurent de Normandie, giving them full power and authority to make an inventory of, and to sell my goods, to procure money, in order to comply with the contents hereof. Dated this 25th day of April, 1564. So be it. JOHN CALVIN."

And so John Calvin died leaving neither wife, son, nor daughter, worth not more than 250 crowns, as merchants and traders would say. But is it not worthy of remark how much *moral* power a person may have in society accompanied with little or no pecuniary power?

and how often do we see great pecuniary power associated with the least conceivable degree of moral power? The talents of some men do more for society than the wealth of a Croesus, or the sword of a Cesar.

The will of Calvin furnishes another proof that men often *feel free agency* one way, and reason another; and that after the verbiage of controversy is pruned off, the points of agreement are more numerous and of incomparably greater magnitude than the points of disagreement, even between the fiercest Protestant antagonists. John Calvin strenuously contended for special atonement; and yet, when dictating his last will and testament, witnessed to by Theodore Beza and other distinguished men, he rejoices to think and feel that Jesus "*died for all poor sinners.*"

The tincture of the system, the moral tinge of his Institutes, is nevertheless apparent in his feelings as expressed in his will. On the subject of remission he speaks vaguely, and it appears to have been with him rather an object of hope than a matter of fruition.

EDITOR.

THE CIRCULAR

OF THE NORTH DISTRICT ASSOCIATION,

WHICH MET ON THE 23D OF JULY LAST IN MONTGOMERY CO. KY.

THIS Association reported 1382 members, and agreed at their last meeting to divest themselves of the last attribute of an ecclesiastical tribunal or authoritative council, by dissolving their Constitution. The brethren composing it are to meet on the 3d Saturday of August, 1832, at Sharpsburg, Ky.

The Circular which appears in the Minutes before me is written with so much moderation, christian temper, and good sense, and is so much to the point, that we judge it worthy of a more extensive circulation, and of a more careful perusal, than the great mass of circulars every day issuing from the numerous Sanhedrims, large and small, which are now quaking for their existence over this vast continent.

ED. M. H.

CIRCULAR LETTER.

Dear Fellow-Christians,

IN meeting your expectations in hearing from us, through the medium of a general address, we are glad to embrace this opportunity of presenting you with some matters that have fallen under our observation since the last meeting of North District Association of Baptists. Whilst we would ever earnestly urge upon our brethren love and good works, and for them to keep all the ordinances of the Lord's house blameless, we are sorry to have to address you under circumstances not as propitious as we could wish: for although harmony and christian affection generally prevail in the churches composing our own body, yet we are surrounded by scenes of discord that mar the happiness and interrupt the free intercourse of christian enjoyment. We have not only the united opposition of all the various sects, but are even opposed by brethren of the same hope; and we are assured that nothing can save us from the desolations of this fell destroying tempest of clerical opposition and domination but the rich panoply of that gospel which is "the power and wisdom of

God." Whilst we regulate our lives by a conformity to the word of God, the shafts of opposition will fall harmless at our feet. We have concluded it best, dear brethren, to notice the principal objections urged against us by some of our brethren, who have withdrawn their fellowship from us, and which will form, in part, the subject of this address. And here we beg leave to remark, that let those brethren say what they will concerning us, let us never speak evil of them—never return railing for railing, or reproaches for reproaches—it is unbecoming our characters as christians so to do; for, let them act towards us or speak of us as they may, their improprieties should rather draw forth our christian sympathies and prayers, and can never furnish us with a justification for violating that law of Christ which forbids our speaking evil of any man. To err is human, and we have no doubt but we have many errors to ask forgiveness for; and, whilst that is the case, we should always cultivate a forgiving, kind, and charitable temper, seeing that the scripture saith, that "if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." And whilst we are fully aware that perfection belongs not to any man, or an entire exemption from error to any body of people, we should ever be ready to accord to others that indulgence for their weakness and their improprieties which we ask for ourselves. At the same time we would remark, that to persist in error, if that error can be manifested from the word of God, we utterly disclaim as forming any part of our character. The first item of objections to which we shall call your attention as presented by our brethren of the opposition, is—

1. We are charged with denying "the special operation of the Spirit in quickening the dead sinner." [See their Goshen Minutes.]

In answer to this, we in the first place remark, that the expression "special operation of the Spirit" is no where to be found in the Bible, and in teaching the christian religion in reference to man's receiving the Holy Spirit, we prefer the using of Bible terms to those terms invented by men, because the Apostles would not speak of those things in words taught by human wisdom, but in "words taught by the Holy Spirit." 1 Cor. ii. 13. We do not believe, neither have we ever taught, that men could be christians without receiving the Holy Spirit; but the difference between us and our opposing brethren, is this:—We teach *that the Spirit is received through faith*, whilst we understand them to teach *that its first reception and operation is in unbelief* We know of no promise of the Holy Spirit to any person, in the Bible, whilst in unbelief; but, on the contrary, the Apostle Paul expressly teaches that "*without faith* it is *impossible* to please God;" and the Saviour says (John xiv. 17.) that the Comforter, or Holy Spirit, which *he* would send, "the world *cannot* receive." Our opposers say it *can*—Jesus says it *cannot*. Our opponents say that the sinner must be regenerated by the Spirit before he believes Paul says, (Gal. iii. 14.) "that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith," and not in unbelief. The Saviour says, (John vii. 38, 39.) "He that believeth" [not one that dont believe] "on me as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that *believe* on him" [not those who would not believe] "*should* receive," [not, had received before they believed.] Again, Paul, (Eph. i. 13.) "In whom ye also trusted, after" [not before] "that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, *after* that ye believed," [not before] "ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise," &c. Again, (Gal. iv. 6.) "Because ye *are sons*," [not unbelievers] "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." And Peter, on the day of Pentecost, says, (Acts ii. 38) 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall" [not, that ye had already received, but] "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." From the foregoing it is evident that neither the miraculous nor common gifts of the Holy Spirit were *ever promised* to men in unbelief. Now, brethren, we know that if any man has not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his; and we do teach men that

they must believe and obey the gospel, in order to the reception and enjoyment of the Holy Spirit.

The 2d objection is, "that we teach that the *mere* act of baptism or immersion *alone* can wash away sins; or, in other words, that mere baptism *alone* constitutes regeneration."

In answer to this we say, we do not believe, neither do we teach that immersion *alone* can wash away sins, or that it is regeneration. But we do believe and teach that "he that believeth" [not one that *dont* believe or *cant* believe] "and is immersed, shall be saved." Mark xvi. 16. And we do teach that Peter (Acts ii. 38.) did tell the believing Jews, or those who gladly received the word, to "repent and be immersed for the *remission* of sins;" and that Ananias, by the *immediate direction of the Lord*, did say unto Saul, (not that his sins were washed away, but) "Arise, and be *immersed and wash away thy sins*, calling upon the name of the Lord." That the Eunuch, and the Jailor with his household, *heard* the *word, believed* it, were *immersed*, and did *rejoice* in the Lord, &c. &c &c. And as the Apostles did thus teach, so we believe and so we teach—and those things which God has joined together *we will not* put asunder.

The 3d objection is, that we receive and administer baptism upon "a bare historical faith;" or that we will baptize any person who merely *says* he believes that Jesus is the Christ.

As to the term "historical faith," it being an invention of men, of which the Bible knows nothing, we consequently have nothing to do with it; but we do teach that for a man to believe with all his heart, through the teaching or word of the Apostles according to John xvii. 20. and xx. 30, 31, and confess it with the mouth, that no man can forbid water; for proof of which we refer to Acts viii. 37. And *we know we are right* when we do as the primitive christians did in the Apostles' day, by the Apostles' directions.

The 4th and last objection which we shall notice for the present, is, that we deny "heart-felt religion, or christian experience."

This we do humbly conceive has arisen from a misapplication of terms. We cannot see how a man can have the experience of a *christian* until he is one—all the workings of his mind before he becomes a christian, we could only call faith and repentance, and not christian experience; therefore, whatever an individual may feel or experience either in mind or body, of either despondency, or hope and joy, before he becomes a christian, we humbly conceive it would be a great prostitution of language to call "*christian experience.*" We therefore do not call it such; yet we believe that every christian has felt these sensations more or less vivid: but we cannot call or recognize (neither do they) any man or woman as a christian until they have, by a confession with the mouth of their faith, and by immersion, become one: They may have felt all the dark and desponding sensations, commonly talked about, and all those happy and joyous feelings, and yet, unless they *obey* the Lord Jesus Christ, we cannot call them christians or invite them to the Lord's table—neither do, or will any of our opposers. Whilst we admit, then, that those feelings and sensations are experienced by every person, more or less, before they are baptized, we cannot, nevertheless, agree to call it "*a christian experience;*" for the individual has not as yet put on Christ. We believe that it is by faith and obedience an individual has the promise of the Spirit, and that they do feel and rejoice in the promises of God; and we do set at naught all Babylonish terms and phrases, not found in the word of God, and all traditions, and all commandments, and doctrines of men, and urge all to disregard every thing, as matters of faith or practice, not found in the word of God. We, therefore, profess to be followers of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of no mortal man; and our enemies, who, by way of opprobium, call us followers of Alexander Campbell, do (while we are following in the footsteps of Christ) insult the King of Saints, by robbing God of his own glory and giving it to man.

You have no doubt heard much about us and against us on the subject of reformation, by all sorts of people, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, &c. &c.

and you have no doubt had it rung in your ears again and again, that we wanted to *reform religion*. Now to set this matter in a light so clear that we need not be misunderstood by any person in future, we here say, that this is a mistake or a misrepresentation We want no reformation of religion. By religion, we mean that *divine system of faith and worship delivered us by Christ and his Apostles*, a reformation of which no man in his senses can or ought to desire; but a reformation of our lives, as the professed children of God, we do desire; nay, we do most earnestly exhort, admonish, entreat, and persuade men to live as the gospel tells them to live, and not to be running about after the vain and foolish things of men's invention. Brethren, ye know how that the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ was established by him and his Apostles in the world, near 1800 years ago: this fact ought to prove to us that the many religions which are now upon the face of the earth were never authorized by Jesus Christ; and ought not men to be taught to obey God rather than man—to reform their lives and obey God's commandments, not man's? Should not this now be urged upon all?

Take, for example, the Methodist religion. The contradistinguishing traits by which this religion is known from all others, were invented in the year 1729, only 102 years ago, by Mr John Wesley. Would any man in his senses call this the christian religion? If he did, then the christian religion is only 102 years old, for a Methodist was never heard of before that time. Again, the characteristics of the Presbyterian religion were invented by Mr. John Knox of Scotland, in the time of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Elizabeth, Queen of England, in the year 1561—2, and perfected in its present form in 1643, when the Westminster Divines made them a Confession of Faith. Again, the Episcopal Church of England was established, not by King Jesus or his Apostles, but by an act of the British Parliament, passed the 3d of November, 1534, under Henry VIII. styled by Pope Leo X. "Defender of the Faith," and afterwards perfected in the reign of Edward VI. in the year 1547, though her liturgy has since been frequently revised. Without noticing the little ones, this is the origin of these powerful sects of religionists, the oldest of which is only 297 years old; and should not men be told to reform from these, and turn to the religion of Jesus? And where, pray, can we find that divine system of faith and worship instituted by Jesus Christ, but in his word—the New Testament? the religion of which was established 1800 years ago, by signs and wonders and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, God hearing also joint witness. There is where we go; for no Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Methodist can say that his religion was established by such signs, wonders, miracles, &c. Then men should quit them and let them alone. But some of our Baptist brethren say, 'Why dont you teach them the doctrine of our confession of faith?' Why, brethren, the reason is, from the days of the Apostles we never had any other confession of faith but the New Testament, down to the year 1689, and then it was with great difficulty that our brethren could be persuaded to make one. It was upwards of 40 years after the Westminster Divines had made theirs, before the Baptists could be persuaded to have any thing to do with any but the New Testament—and then but seven churches agreed to that. This took place in the city of London, only 142 years ago; and the Philadelphia Confession was made on the 25th September, 1742, only 89 years ago; and if we were to stop at their dates we should greatly fall short of the date of the christian religion. Now we know that all these things may be reformed; but after they are reformed, what are they? At best it only can be said that it is reformed Methodism, reformed Presbyterianism, reformed Episcopacy, &c. These are all matters of men's invention, and may be reformed, altered, changed, modified, or abolished, (as they all will be,) and yet the christian religion remain unscathed—untouched by their destruction. The world was once without all these religions, and will be so again; but the christian religion, which existed 1500 years before the oldest of them, is destined to live forever; and we are bold to affirm that it NEVER can be reformed; but our lives may be: and we do most earnestly desire all men to shape their conduct—their lives by the word

of God, and not by the word of man. Is this heresy? If it is, then we are heretics. Now we contend for neither more nor less than this—that God's word should be regarded in all cases, and at all times, and under all circumstances, without glossing or wresting it for any purpose. And now we will tell you why you should also be in favor of such a reformation too. You know [and if you dont, if you will read your book you will know] how that the ten tribes of Israel, after being rent from the house of David 254 years, were, by by Shalmanezer, king of Assyria, carried away captive 722 years before the birth of our Saviour, and have not been correctly heard of since. One hundred and sixteen years after, the remaining two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, were also carried off captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, where they remained 70 years. You know also that Malachi foretold the coming of a great and terrible day of the Lord; but that before it came he would send them Elijah the prophet, who should turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of children to the fathers, lest he smite the earth with a curse. Accordingly John the Baptist (the Elijah) came; and what did he do? He came preaching in the wilderness of Judea the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins—that men should bring forth fruits meet for repentance. He came proclaiming a reformation of life. As a nation the Jews did not reform, and the consequence was, the entire destruction of their temple and nation by Titus the Roman General, on the 10th day of August, in the year 70. Now what do you suppose were the causes of these tremendous displays of God's indignation? By reference to the word of God, it was, first, a neglect, on the part of the Jews, in attending to the law of Moses. Second, by doing or substituting other matters in lieu of the law of Moses. Third, by regarding their traditions or customs (as some of our brethren are now doing) as of equal weight and dignity with the law of God By examining you will find these things are so; for the Saviour, you know, charged boldly upon the Jewish rulers and teachers the arrogance of sitting in Moses' seat, (that is, making laws like Moses,) of teaching doctrines and commandments of men—of setting aside the law of God by their traditions. And what, let us ask, are all these decorums, confessions of faith, disciplines, rules or formulas, but doctrines and commandments of men? Did Jesus ever command them to be made? Had he wanted any beside the New Testament, would he not, think you, have made them himself? He certainly would. If God, then, punished the Jews in the tremendous manner here spoken of, for their neglect of the law of Moses, and for their substituting their traditions in room of it, how can we expect to escape a punishment of which the foregoing judgments are but types, if we neglect to hear his *Son*, in whom he is well pleased, or substitute in lieu of, or in addition to his commandments, as they are laid down in the book, any of our traditions, rules, or formulas.

Peter, on the mount of transfiguration, proposed to build three tabernacles—one for Christ, one for Moses, and one for Elias. But what said the voice from heaven? "This is my beloved Son: hear him." To which we respond, Amen! We say, hear the Lord Jesus in all things, regardless of what men have said, or what they may say; and as he never told his Apostles to hear any man, so we teach no man to hear either Wesley, or Knox, or Calvin, or Luther, or Gill, or Arminius, or Campbell; for if we did, it would be teaching doctrines and commandments of men. A greater sin no man can hardly commit, the word of God being judge. John says, "Blessed are they that do his commandments," not these men's commandments just named above, but Christ's commandments, "that they may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city." Brethren, keep yourselves unspotted from the world—live a christian life—adorn the doctrine of Christ our Saviour—neglect not the assembling of yourselves together, as the custom of some is, but be steadfast, immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. If reproaches and revilings be ours, let us go forth unto Jesus, without the camp, bearing his reproach; for here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come. By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually; that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communi-

cate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Brethren, pray for us, for we trust we have a good conscience in all things, willing to live honestly. And now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

OBSERVER & TELEGRAPH, HUDSON, OHIO.

THIS paper is devoted to the interests of Presbyterianism. It is edited by Mr. Warren Isham, and published by Mr. Lewis Ferry. Mr. Isham has obtained the title of *Reverend* among the sect to which he belongs. And as there are so many more priests than good and responsible congregations, it has become necessary to find posts for men of talents, and to create offices for distinguished men whose price is not bid up by some wealthy congregation. For it no longer stands true of the poor congregations as of the rich—I was just about to make a wrong application of one of the genuine characteristics of christianity—"the poor have the gospel preached to them." It was not of poor Presbyterian congregations that this was spoken. For had Jesus spoken in accordance with Presbyterianism in our times, he would have said, "Blessed are the rich congregations, for they have the gospel preached unto them; but wo to the poor, for they are behind in both worlds." But to come to the point, Mr. Isham fills one of these offices. He is one of the scribes of the sect, and has the supervision of the above named paper.

In my June tour to the Lakes I delivered two discourses in this same Hudson, and I learned that this Mr. Isham was present taking such notes of my discourses as would enable him in the most acceptable manner to censure and repudiate the reformation which we plead.

Another gentleman of the same cloth heard me at Ravennah. I think he calls himself "Ambrose." But so it is, that from the 16th of June till now these true sons of the church militant have been roasting and frying my discourses in this same Observer and Telegraph. "Ambrose," if I mistake not, for I do not read all his pieces, has written several essays to prove that I am a "perfect Arian," but secretly I manage to conceal it from all but himself. Soon as he heard me pray, he *knew* perfectly that "I was *a perfect Arian*." This gentleman is too wise for this world; and having obtained the gift of discerning spirits, we cannot contend with him. So long, however, as I keep it a secret, and am afraid to avow it, it will do no harm. He ought not to have divulged it. He has done all the mischief, if any result from the discovery.

I wonder if this Mr. Ambrose ever read the life of John Calvin? if not, he has fortuitously stumbled upon the plan which the Catholics played with so much success against the founder of his own sect. When his good Father Calvin had bearded the lion in his den, and had made the Vatican tremble, they cried out, "Protestants beware! *Calvin is a perfect Arian!!*"

Mr. Isham and his brother Ambrose had better read Mackenzie's

Life of Calvin, if they can get no fuller history of this great man. For a great man he truly was, and did as much as any man of so choleric a temperament could do in such an age, coming out of the bosom of Popery. It was true of him, as of all who have to oppose a corrupt hierarchy, "Calvin made himself enemies by saying cutting truths." His biographer adds to these words, "Perhaps a consciousness of superiority rendered him severe upon those who disturbed him by *ill-founded* attacks, or unreasonable obstinacy." But the Catholics accused him of *Arianism*, and in the year 1535, or '36, "he was obliged to plead his cause with Caroly, at Bern, who (like "Ambrose" of Portage) accused him of Arianism." But this was before he had established his reputation for orthodoxy by the burning of Servetus; and before Beza, his great disciple and admirer, had written a book to prove that the "Magistrates ought to punish heretics by the sword." This wiped off, in the estimation of all good Catholics, the charge of Arianism."

Any man who can think that we, who have asserted the most unpopular of all the tenets of this age, faith and immersion for the remission of sins, can, through shame or fear, conceal our sentiments on such a question, deserves medicine rather than argument; and he that tells such a tale, requires either the discipline of Calvin, or, if that be too severe, a parole of honor from the ranks of gentlemen. Regarding Ambrose, then, in the character of a "*false accuser*," Paul commands me "from such to turn away."

Mr. Isham wrote some seven or eight columns on my two discourses in Hudson. The last of these I read the other day: a friend handed it to me at Lisbon, on the 28th ultimo. Mr. Isham wrote it for the consumption of Presbyterians, and therefore it found not its way to me. Concerning the whole review, I will only say it is just such a one as a man of Mr. Isham's talents and constitutional frailties could write. A single specimen of the logical character of his mind will excuse me, in the estimation of all men of sense, from paying him any farther attention. In his first attack, he says—

"Mr. C. in this stage of his discourse, had not a little to say about his being a Reformer. It could not be expected, he said, that Luther and his coadjutors would rise up, Sampson-like, and in two or three years, shake off the whole Romish superstition. And yet, he could not say the word 'reform,' but all tongues were in motion. Did not Luther and Calvin live only three hundred years ago? But look, said he, at the fragments of the Lutheran Reformation—Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, Burghers and Anti-Burghers, Covenanters, &c. &c. Here was proof positive that another Reformation was needed,—and he even went so far as to say, that a Reformation was as much needed now, as at the time when Luther arose: and 'a reformer,' he added, needs to be clothed with the same armor—the same panoply of heaven. But what would Mr Campbell be at? Would he have but one sect in christendom? *Then we must have a Pope, acknowledge his infallibility, and bow to his mandates; then we must have an Inquisition—and for arguments, we must resort to the faggot, the pincers, and the rack; then we must take away the 'key of knowledge from the people, and envelope them in clouds of ignorance, dark as midnight.* In this way we might prevent the multiplicity of sects. In this way the Church of Rome

prevented it during that night of dark ages which hung over the world, before the Reformation of the 16th century. But as long as the people have the Bible in their hands, and are allowed to be their own interpreters; as long as their minds are differently constituted, and furnished with different degrees of intelligence, and their hearts in different stages of moral culture, there will be shades of difference in their views of divine truth. Those truths which lie at the foundation of the christian's hope are clearly revealed; and here is common ground. All evangelical sects see alike here. It is in things of less concernment that they differ in opinion; things of so little importance, that the Almighty has but partially revealed them."

That I might place him in bold relief before the reader, I quoted the whole paragraph.

Gentle, and sensible, and courteous reader, must we pursue through all the lanes and avenues of sophistry, a writer who, when he does his best, cannot discriminate between Popery and Protestantism — who either thinks himself, or would have others to think, that if ever the church or christian community be united, we must have a Pope, Inquisition, fire and sword in that united church, to suppress all differences of opinion, &c. &c. &c.!!! We *italicise* the above lines in the extract. Let the reader regard them as emphatic. And can this intellectual editor do otherwise than build up a sect and *guard Hudson College*, when he avows his conviction that the end of sectarianism will be a universal Pope, an Inquisition, and a night of darkness! The Millennium! What a fearful era, if all christians should constitute but one society!

With such a writer we have no chance, and must permit him to make notes, and comment on his own text, till next we visit Hudson. I think from his increased sensibility we must have done some good in Hudson, and must the sooner visit it again. EDITOR.

ESSEX, SEPTEMBER 2, 1831.

Dear Brother Campbell,

YOUR favor of the 19th of August came to hand during my absence on a tour of proclaiming the ancient gospel. I met with six public teachers of the ancient gospel on Saturday last, in King William, where we had a four days' meeting: the two first being rainy weather, the congregations surpassed our expectation. On Saturday bro. Ainslie unsheathed the sword of the Spirit, and threw the scabbard of sectarianism to the moles and the bats—presented the *naked sword* of the Lord of Hosts—death or submission were the only terms offered to the rebels against the government of King Messiah. The gospel proclamation was made. I never before witnessed such a moving among the people. Seventeen were immersed, the next morning, for the remission of their sins. On the Lord's day and Monday, never did I hear the *naked truth* sound so sweet and powerful. The invitation was again given: upwards of forty young men and women came forward and professed—from their exterior, the flower of that section of country. It was a sight, indeed, to see between twenty and thirty young females advance with all that is lovely, bowing to the blessed Jesus. They confessed themselves sinners

and their faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God; that they *loved him*, and wished to be immersed into his name for the remission of their sins. About twenty were immersed that evening; the rest, not having clothes, had to put off their entrance into the kingdom to another day.* We conversed with many before their profession, as they wished to understand their condition. Many were trammelled by the systems of the day, looking for the Holy Spirit to produce an extraordinary ecstasy—all anxious to follow Jesus. It was a great trial, to some, to forsake their father's creed; but when the truth was affectionately presented to them, as coming from the loving Jesus, it was more than they could withstand. I conversed with a young man and his lady, recently married. They came with locked hands to *inquire into the truth of the gospel faith*, as many others did in the same way. He professed great anxiety to be saved. I asked his lady if she believed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, and was willing to submit to his government, and give up every thing to enjoy his salvation? She replied it was her greatest desire to be saved, but seemed not to understand how sinners could be saved. I asked her if she did not understand her companion when he professed to her his love for her person? whether her heart was not concerned in the offer, and how she consented to accept of his proposals to give her his hand in marriage? Had you seen her sparkling eye, with a tear of gratitude when she looked her companion in the face, after hearing this, you would have had no wonder that tears should flow from his eyes. It seemed to penetrate his soul. There were several young men, with their wives, that came forward and owned Jesus as Lord of all. We do not consider this in the popular phrase the "pouring out of the Spirit," but the unsheathing of the sword of the Spirit from the scabbard of sectarianism. The lower country appears to be alive. Sectarianism must die. Peter Ainslie certainly is a man of uncommon strength of mind, and now a bold advocate for the ancient apostolic gospel. With such men as Ainslie, Duval, and Richards, we fear not opposition *upon the New Testament.*

According to your request I have sent you a copy of A. Broaddus' Review of the Extra. He, to my judgment, has failed in sustaining *his own views*, much less in overturning the Extra. He seems as though he sought, not intentionally I hope, to find a refuge for the disobedient, and in doing so, sets Jesus against himself, as well as Paul against himself. However little our opponents may make of baptism, Jesus says, He that breaks *one of these least* commandments, and *teaches men so*, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall *do* and *teach them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Yours in the Lord,

THOS. M. HENLEY.

---

* Delays are dangerous. Procrastination is the thief of souls, as well as of time. *To-day*, and not to-morrow, says the Lord. Nothing that is not insuperable can justify delays in submitting to the Lord. ED.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.—*Part 4th.*

AUSTIN AND TIMOTHY.

Austin. I have just been examining *nine* essays on the work of the Holy Spirit, in the 2d volume of the *Christian Baptist*, and have had my attention most arrested to the following sentences: [Jan. 3, 1825, vol. 2, No. 2, page 33, 2d edition.] "This is one distinguishing difference between the disciples of Christ before, and since he was glorified. Those who believed and became his disciples, seeing the miracles he wrought, on the evidence afforded them, *had to wait for the promise of the Spirit through faith* a good while, and some a long time time, till Christ was glorified. But they who became his disciples after he was glorified soon received the Holy Spirit. For after Christ was glorified, in one day thousands born of water and of the Spirit entered into the kingdom, and immediately were filled with love, peace, joy, long suffering, goodness, fidelity, meekness, and temperance—the blissful cluster of heavenly fruits of which the sons of God are all partakers." The other matters in these essays have become familiar. But on this extract I wish to propose a question. It is this: *Is there any difference between the manner in which christians enjoy the Holy Spirit since Jesus was glorified, and the manner in which the saints enjoyed the Spirit of God before the appearance of Jesus Christ in the world?*

Timothy. As well might you inquire, Were the saints *under the law* as enlightened and happy as christians under the reign of favor? As to the *manner* of enjoyment I speculate not; as to the *degree* of enjoyment, our state, in comparison of the Jewish and Patriarchal, is called "heavenly places," and the government under which we have our citizenship is called "*the Reign of Heaven.*" But in the same page from which you have made the above quotation, a promise uttered by Jesus is quoted in justification of the principal idea suggested in the extract: "He that believes on me, as the Scripture says, shall prove a cistern, whence rivers of living water shall flow." On this an Apostle comments as follows: "This he spoke of the Spirit which they who believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet (given) because Jesus was not yet glorified."

The glorification or coronation of Jesus in heaven after he had been made perfect through sufferings, is an event of inexpressible importance in the great scheme of our redemption, and the revolution of things in heaven and things on earth consequent thereupon, is a theme on which Prophets and Apostles dwell with admiration. Then it was all angels, principalities, authorities, and powers were subjected to him; then it was, having received the promise of the Holy Spirit in all its gifts, he began to confer these gifts on men. Hence in announcing his exaltation to the throne of God, Peter promised the Holy Spirit to all who submitted to his government, but to none else.

A. But had not Christ, while on earth, power to impart this spirit; or, rather, did he not bestow it upon his Apostles before he was glorified?

T. When he first sent his Apostles to announce his approaching reign, he gave them *authority* over unclean spirits, to expel them, and to heal all diseases and maladies. He himself had received the Holy Spirit without measure after his immersion, and imparted to his Apostles power to sustain their proclamation by these attestations. But let us now keep our attention fixed upon the principal idea furnished in your extract, or rather in the quotation which authorizes it. Jesus is now glorified, and all who now submit to his government are authorized to expect not new revelations, miracles, or prophetic powers, but that Holy Spirit whose inhabitation resembles a cistern from which streams of water ever flow. Hence all the joys and consolations which those who obey the gospel experience.

A. I think this is a subject on which there will not be much controversy between us. Since reading those essays in the volume alluded to, I abandon the idea of the Spirit descending through the air, or falling upon persons as in the times of the setting up of the christian institution, and also the popular doctrines on this subject; but that disciples are in some way possessed of the Spirit of God is so plain that I cannot think any person can at all doubt the fact, though none may be able to comprehend how these things can be.

T. It is sometimes useful to reason from analogy though *analogy* can *prove* nothing. Analogies may illustrate, but cannot prove any thing in religion. But as the Great Teacher so often reasoned from analogy, illustrated and adorned his heavenly communications by earthly analogies, because we can arrive at the knowledge of things unknown only by the things already known, we may reason analogically upon this subject as well as upon some others; but the nice point is to know how far to follow any analogy.

A. Yes; this is the delicate point--so delicate that few of our annotators in commenting upon the types of the Old Testament, and the parables of the New, have known where to stop.

T. There are some parables which have but one prominent point of similarity to enforce, while others may have several; and so it happens that few sermonizers seem to know how far to pursue or to trace the analogies in these parables—some falling short, and others greatly transcending the design of him who introduced it. All would seem to agree that in comparing the kingdom of heaven to a grain of mustard seed, it was designed only to illustrate the smallness of its beginning, its progress, and extensive growth in the world; and that he who would say a grain of mustard seed is *round*, *brown*, and *pungent*, and seek to find similarities in the kingdom of heaven, would, in the estimation of all, transcend the bounds of sober reason. He also, who in the parable of the sower finds but one point of resemblance, falls as far short of the design of its author, as he who imagines resemblances where there are none.

A. Of these aberrations from right reason I am convinced. But what analogies have you to offer on this subject.

T. Many. The church, or congregated disciples of Jesus Christ, are compared to a human body, a temple, or house, a family, a king-

dom, a sheepfold, a vine, &c. Some of these figures or comparisons represent this institution more forcibly than others in reference to some particular object. And were it not for these various objects we should not have had these various comparisons. It is true that some or all of these may illustrate one or more prominent features in this institution; but yet each one of them seems to have some peculiar object in view, to illustrate which it is primarily intended. The first of these we have already noticed in our second interview; and it is one to which more frequent allusion is made by the Apostle Paul than any other. But as a brother and fellow-laborer, whose praise in the gospel is far spread through the congregations, and whose labors deserve to be highly appreciated, has made much use of this figure in a discourse recently published, and which he is now revising for a second edition, I shall not now dwell upon it, but refer you to brother Scott's discourse on the Holy Spirit.

A. That discourse I read immediately after our second interview, and it gave me much relief on one important item; but I shall read it again when revised; for it seems as if the Printer or Proof-reader had made it almost, if not altogether, unintelligible in some places.

T. The Holy Spirit made the literal body of Jesus by its influences; and afterwards filled it. But it was not until he was born again in the Jordan, that the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descended upon him; and this Spirit, not in measures, but without measure, ever after abode in him as the spirit of wisdom, power, and goodness. This same Holy Spirit, by its various gifts, creates the figurative body of Jesus, as before illustrated; and when any person is united to the body of Christ, which is ever growing, he receives the Spirit which always dwells in that body. But to refer to other figures.

The tabernacle was built by Moses; but Moses built it by supernatural aid, according to a model which God himself gave him. After this tabernacle was put together, raised, and dedicated to the Lord, a cloud covered, sat upon it, and *the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.* Exod. xl. 33—38.

A. The temple, too, was built by Solomon; and after it was finished and every thing put in its place, and after the Priests had come out of the holy place from putting the ark of the covenant in its place, "the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the Priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; *for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.*" The Lord promised to abide there so long as they kept his commandments. He says to Solomon, "My eyes and my heart shall be in that house perpetually. But if you shall at all turn from following me, you or your children, and will not keep my statutes and my commandments which I have set before you; then will I cast out of my sight this house which I have hallowed, and Israel shall be a proverb and a by-word among all people. And at this house which is high, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished and shall hiss."

T. Let me add, that Paul tells us that christians are the temple of God, and that the Lord dwells in them – his Spirit inhabits them.

This is the glory of Jesus which fills the house of prayer which he has reared. The Holy Spirit thus glorifies him by filling his house with glory. His eye and his heart are here continually. If any man destroy the temple of the Lord, by polluting it, him will the Lord destroy. If any man love not our Lord Jesus, let him be *anathema maranatha*. They shall yet hiss at him. The obedient only constitute this house of God, and it is only over them that the Lord's eyes and heart continually preside. The Lord's eyes are over the righteous, and his ear is open to their cry. "The temple of God is holy, which temple you christians are."

These analogies illustrate that promise of the Holy Spirit given to them who reform and are immersed for the remission of their sins. But as the tabernacle was first reared and dedicated, the temple first builded and furnished, before the glory of the Lord filled it, so the Spirit is promised and given to none until they are united to the building of God—the church.

A. Here we have no controversy. I can aid you in these analogies. Let us next contemplate the vine, or the olive tree, as analogous. A branch must be in the vine, or it receives no sap from its root: and a graft must be inserted into the good olive tree before it partakes of its root and fatness. And are we not first engrafted into Christ before we can derive any consolation, peace, hope, or joy from him?

T. True: Jesus says, "As the branch can bear no fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, no more can you my disciples unless you abide in me—I am the vine, you are the branches." He is the root of that goodly vine which the great Vine-dresser has planted in the earth. It requires no reasoning to show that all the powers of the vine flow in the channels originating in its root, and that adhesion to the vine is essential to the life and fruitfulness of every bough. But alas! this vine has been exposed to the wild boar of the forest, and to the wild beast of the field. "Return, we beseech thee, O God of Hosts; look down from heaven and behold and visit this thy vine!—the vineyard which thy right hand has planted, and the branch which thou madest strong for thyself!"

But it is only in reference to the Gentiles that the figure of grafting into the olive occurs in the New Testament. The Westminster Confession of Faith says, "Baptism signifies and seals our engrafting into Christ:" if so, then we cannot expect to partake of the streams which make glad the vine, which clothe it with fragrance, beauty, and fruit, until we are immersed into the Lord. But we cannot farther carry the figure of engrafting than to show that until the scion is engrafted it receives no nourishment from the root, but when engrafted it receives all its health and fatness from it. These analogies illustrate the two great propositions on which our present conversation turns. We ought sooner to have stated them. Sometimes, however, it is as satisfactory to prove and illustrate a proposition before it is stated. The propositions to which we allude, are, *that the Holy Spirit is promised to no unbeliever, or disobedient person;* and that,

since Christ was glorified in heaven, *the Holy Spirit is promised to all who believe and obey the gospel*, or to all who unite themselves to the family of God.

A. I wonder if this be not all implied in the promises in the New Constitution, as you call it, Heb. viii. 10—13. "I will be their God," is one promise; "I will write my laws upon their hearts," is another; but the reason assigned is the fourth promise, which is the root of the whole matter—"FOR *their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more.*" Remission of these, then, precedes all the promises of the New Covenant.

T. You mean that although remission of sins is last mentioned in the New Constitution, it is laid both by Paul and Jeremiah as the root and foundation of all the blessings promised in it.

A. I do. And let me propose another question—Does it not appear most irrational, inapposite, as well as unscriptural, to represent the Spirit, the *Holy* Spirit of God, as dwelling in the heart of an impenitent, disobedient sinner?

T. But if we seem to agree so well, we shall have no controversy on this subject, and no new light will be elicited. Can you think of nothing in which there is not a perfect concordance in our views?

A. Perhaps I may: but I am called hence at present. I know that on this subject there can be but little difference between us. The difficulty always was about the influences necessary to produce faith; about regeneration anterior to faith, or the infusion of some previous holy principle But now, seeing how the Holy Spirit has confirmed the testimony, and how faith was produced in the minds of the first converts, I will have little difficulty in agreeing with you in the proposition which affirms that every one who believes and is baptized receives the Holy Spirit of God, in all its moral and sanctifying influences; but perhaps on reflection I will have something to propose you hereafter on this subject. Adieu. EDITOR.

☞MR. COHEN.

SINCE our last number was issued we received two letters from our friend *Mr. Cohen.* One of them contains some objections to our reasonings on the publication now before the public. These we will hereafter lay before our readers. It is due to Mr. Cohen to state, that, in consequence of our limits having obliged us to omit the preface to his apology, he has demurred at the attitude in which he is presented without his preface—appearing rather as *volunteering* in the cause, than as vindicating his deceased brother from the charge of weakness, or from making concessions which he supposes, under other circumstances, in full possession of his memory and judgment, he would not have made. He also, from a want of time, and from a conviction that little good can be done by controverting the grounds of his disbelief, or our belief in Jesus of Nazareth, declares his unwillingness to write much upon the subject, and therefore rather declines prosecuting the matter much farther; not at all, however, from any doubt he has of the certainty or the validity of his reasons

against Jesus, or of his hopes of a Messiah who will yet gather the dispersed of Israel into one———

These remarks are due to Mr. Cohen, that his course in this publication may be fairly estimated by all who may read our correspondence.

LETTER TO MR. COHEN—*No. III.*

Dear Sir,

WHEN I consider the numerous blessings which we Gentiles inherit from your father Abraham, and from your nation, I feel myself in debt to every Jew under heaven, and would rejoice in discharging that debt to the eternal happiness of every person in whose veins flows the blood of the renowned father of many nations, honored with the title of "*the Friend of God.*" Truly we may say that the God of Abraham has already verified, in a very particular manner, one of the greatest as well as one of the first promises made to him, which is not generally regarded as it ought. I allude to that stated in Genesis xii. 9. "I will make thee *a blessing*"—a public blessing. He not only promised to bless all nations in his seed, but to make him a blessing to all nations.

I am willing to confess that we Gentiles owe all our just conceptions of God, of his being and perfections, and our progress in all useful knowledge, to the pens of Jews. Egypt, Greece, and Rome gave us not a single correct idea of God—of his spirituality, majesty, and true glory. Their sages leavened not our minds with the knowledge of God; their philosophers and philosophy imparted no vigor to our minds, gave no new energies to our thoughts, nor filled our souls with lofty enterprize. Your Moses and your Prophets—your Kings, and Priests, and Poets have shed all the light and all the lustre which morally adorns any of the race to which we belong.

Yes, my dear sir, our New Testament, too, is the work of Jews—all written by Jews. If there be, then, among the Christians any true knowledge of God; nay, if there be among any people in the four quarters of the globe any sacred literature, any true religion or morality, it has come from the children of Abraham. Thus the Lord made Abraham *a blessing* to all the world in committing to him and his seed all the knowledge of himself and of man, of any importance, in relation to true goodness, greatness, and happiness. The sciences, and all the arts by which christian nations are distinguished and exalted, owe their advancement to that strength of mind which the abolition of idolatry and superstition, through Jewish instrumentality, has effected.

Not only was the first Christian congregation all Jews, but all the writers of the New Testament, were from the loins of Abraham. Your debtors, then, sir, we are. Oh! that, as your Paul and our Apostle has written, through our mercy you also might obtain mercy! You have nothing to promise us by turning us to your nation—by weakening, were it possible, our confidence in the Son of the Virgin as the true Messiah; but we have much to propose to you in turning to the Lord

our Redeemer. He is exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give reformation to Israel and remission of sins. Forgiveness, adoption into the family of God, the Holy Spirit, a glorious resurrection, and eternal life are all held out to you in submitting to him who wept over Jerusalem, and commanded the good news of his salvation to be *first* proclaimed in the very city where he had been crucified a few days before. "To THE JEW FIRST" our Apostle Paul always addressed himself. *To the Jew first* we would feel inclined to tender remission and eternal life in the name of Jesus.

My dear sir, consider what are the sanctions of our religion compared with those of Moses. It is not the loss of Canaan for which you have to weep. We look for a Canaan, a heavenly Canaan, where the *Tree of Life* forever yields its fruit—where the pure water of life forever flows.

But how *feeble*—(pardon this word feeble, for when we read the books of the New Testament and scan the evidences which they tender, we say, how feeble all that can oppose!)—how feeble, then, are arguments or objections such as any Rabbi can propose! Yours are as strong as any. But on what slender grounds do you reject the counsel of God against yourselves.

Concerning the sceptre departing from Judah, you say the literal translation of Gens. xlix. 10. is, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah forever, [though it may for a time;] for Shiloh shall come, and to him shall the nations gather."

The *Seventy* Jews who rendered the five books of Moses into the Greek tongue, 280 years before Christ, differ from some of your present Rabbis in rendering this passage. Their version of it differs nothing in the capital fact from King James' version. From their version, now before me, it reads thus: "A Prince shall not entirely fail from Judah, nor a leader from his offspring, till all that is laid up for him come; even the Expectation of nations. Binding his colt to the vine, and his ass's colt to the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes." So read the 10th and 11th verses.

I am aware that some modern Jews offer very curious criticisms upon the Hebrew word *shebet*, translated by King James' translators *sceptre*. They make it a *rod*, the emblem of afflictions; and then read, "Afflictions shall not depart from Judah till the Messias come."

But Onkelos, the chief of the Targumists, understood it as christians do; and the Jerusalem Targum, and all the ancient versions, adopted it. In one or two ancient versions it is said *sebet*, sometimes rendered *tribe*, is found. But this makes no difference in the meaning, for all the old Rabbis, with the Jerusalem Targum, apply it to the Messiah. The evasions of this passage by many of the modern Jews have given it so many contradictory meanings that the more sensible now begin, like yourself, to admit that it is substantially correct in the common reading. For suppose you should read it, "the sceptre shall not depart *forever*," it militates much more with your views than with ours: for on your hypothesis it has departed from Ju-

dah nearly 2400 years; but Jesus, being placed upon the true throne of David, still extends his sceptre over all the world, and thus the sceptre has never departed from Judah.

This is perhaps but a gloss upon a gloss. So be it. But your David sings, in his second Psalm, "the Lord Jehovah has set his king upon the holy hill of Zion." He has published the decree—"My Son thou art, to-day have I begotten thee." He has given him the heathen people for his people. "Kiss then the Son, lest he be angry and you perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they who trust in him."

It would be long to trace the leaders of the tribe of Judah from the death of Zedekiah to the time of Herod the Great, and unnecessary too; for the fact that Jesus was born in the 35th year of the reign of Herod the Great, and this Herod being the first *foreigner* who was placed over the Jews by the Roman emperors, is enough to show that the sceptre, or prince and leader, had just departed from Judah, and that under the government of the first *foreigner* the long expected king of the Jews was born.

John Hyrcanus died about 481 years after the return from the Babylonish captivity. Josephus regards him in the light of high priest and king. His words are: "He was esteemed by God worthy of the three greatest privileges—*the government of his nation*, the dignity of the high priesthood, and prophecy." Antiq. Book 13, Sect. 7. His son Aristobulus changed the government into a kingdom, and wore the diadem. I need not inform you of all the contests in Judea after his death, under the tyrannical monarchy of the Assamoneans or Maccabees, till the reign of the Idumean, Herod the Great. Shiloh came at the right time, and was received first by a few, but afterwards regarded as the Messiah by many myriads of your brethren; and since his death, I need not tell you, you have not had a prince or leader from Judah nor any other tribe. Two thousand years will soon have completed their rounds since you had a prophet, priest, or king, or a ruler, religious or political, of your own people.

How, then, my dear sir, can you regard all the sayings of your prophets? on what principles can you explain them? Either they have deluded you, or you have mistaken them. What saying, in all the prophets or the law, authorized you to expect a banishment from Canaan, and a dispersion for 2000 years, before the Messiah came!! But admitting him to have been the person crucified on Calvary, then all your prophets are consistent, plain and intelligible.

The writings of the Christian Jews commend themselves to your conscience. Who of all your prophets surpassed Paul in sincerity, zeal, knowledge, labors, and sufferings? Who was more pious or more humane than James or John? Who more illustrious than Peter? Their writings, their doctrine, their labors, their sufferings, their martyrdoms, prove that they followed no cunningly devised fables. Oh that I could induce one son of Abraham to give these witnesses, these *eye and ear witnesses* of the life, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, a candid, honest, and inquisitive hearing!!

Yours sincerely, EDITOR

PRAYER.—NO. I.

Fayette, September 7, 1831.

DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL,

BEING in some measure sensible of the multiplicity of business with which you are pressed, it is with some reluctance that I at this time trouble you. I am, however, the rather induced to do so from having observed the freedom and good nature in which you are wont to respond to the inquiries of the honest-minded in quest of truth. Without any further preface or apology, I will come at once to the object I had in addressing you at this time, and that is, to ask your opinion whether it be lawful, according to the will of God as revealed to us, to pray for our unconverted friends—that is, to ask God to convert them to the christian religion? If it be true, as you affirm, (and which I am not prepared to controvert,) that the righteousness of a christian is a righteousness by *faith* in Jesus as the Messiah; that that faith comes alone by *hearing* or *reading* the testimony concerning Jesus; and that we have no right to expect any influence superinducing the mind to faith, or even causing the sinner to examine this testimony, or place himself in circumstances for the light of Divine Truth to shine upon his mind: I say, upon the supposition that these things are so, what right has any one to expect that God will answer his prayers in the behalf of any of his unconverted friends? Ever since I have felt the importance of divine things, I have felt the most anxious solicitude for many of my relatives and friends who on their part manifested the greatest indifference to these matters, and have often tried to pray for them too, that God would cause them to submit themselves to Jesus as the only Saviour of sinners: but whether these prayers were in accordance to the word of our Divine Master, I confess I am somewhat at a loss to say. When we pray, we are told to pray in faith; and in order that we may pray in faith, as I understand, we should pray for such things as our Heavenly Father has authorized us to expect at his hands, and no other. Now, if the Divine Being exercises no other influence over the minds of men than that influence which is derived to them through the words he has spoken to men, and we cannot prevail upon wicked men to give attention to those words, the question is, Are we authorized to expect that God will answer our requests in the behalf of such an one? Here is my difficulty, and it has long been a difficulty with me; and I find it is no less so with many of my friends, and your friends. If you have opportunity to write me a private letter on this subject, I will esteem it as a singular favor; or if you consider the subject of enough importance, you can, if you please, furnish us an essay upon it through the Harbinger.

Very affectionately, WILL. Z. THOMSON.

BETHANY, VA. September 15, 1831.

Dear Brother Thomson,

WHEN our speculations on any doctrine or question in religion become principles of action contravening any express precept or

approved example found in the sacred writings of the Apostles, it becomes us to pause, and rather to question or dissent from our own reasonings than to neglect to do the things that the Lord has commanded us.

It is not uncommon for us poor short-sighted mortals to take such one-sided views of things, and to be so engrossed in contemplating them as not to see at all, or very imperfectly, things of the very greatest magnitude connected with the other side of the subject. As the flying fish, fixing its eye upon the dolphin, endeavoring to elude its pursuit, sometimes leaps into the ship, or darts into the jaws of the shark, so we, in looking intensely upon one error, sometimes plunge into a greater one than we sought to avoid.

It is, however, a happy circumstance that persons who fear God will, whether they comprehend or not some strong sayings, some plain commands, or some approved examples in the good book, rather dissent from their own reasonings, leading in a contrary direction, than omit, or wholly neglect some very plain duty. A very striking instance of this we have in the prayers and enterprizes of some very zealous professors in our own time. In their creed and in their reasonings they maintain that "men are so predestinated, foreordained, and so particularly and unchangeably designed to everlasting life and everlasting death, and their number so certain and definite, *that it cannot be either increased or diminished*;"* yet they not only pray for the conversion of men, but are active in all "the benevolent enterprizes of the day" for the conversion of sinners at home and abroad. Such inconsistencies prove that men will sooner distrust their own reasonings than the commands and examples laid before them in the sacred writings.

But it does not always happen that apparent incongruities imply actual contradictions in principle or practice. We do not often see the remote, nor indeed always the proximate tendencies of things. Now if persons were never to act in any great question in religion or morals until they saw all the tendencies and results of their conduct, or its agreement or disagreement with other principles and other things, they would perhaps die before they would obey the first christian requisition.

These preliminary observations are not made from the perception or acknowledgment that similar difficulties impinge the question you have submitted, or that even very apparent, much less real incongruities or contradictions, are involved either in its examination or decision. But if even that were the case, we shall find it our wisdom to do the things the Lord commands, whether we can or cannot reconcile them to our own views, or to other things as plainly revealed.

To approach still nearer the subject submitted, please, dear sir, to consider that the Lord Jesus *commanded* us to pray for them who are our enemies, "who despitefully use and even persecute us." We

* Presbyterian and Regular Baptist Confession of Faith, Article iii. Sections 3 & 4.

are also taught that vengeance belongs to the Lord and he will repay our enemies, and that it is just with God to recompense tribulation to them who trouble us. Yet there is nothing incongruous in our repaying their curses with blessings, nor in praying for their reformation and forgiveness.

But the pinching point with many honest minds, and with yours, though somewhat allied to this, is yet quite distinct from it—"If no converting power other than that displayed in the oracles of God is necessary, why pray to God for the salvation of men? And again: If there be no promise nor testimony in favor of those whose salvation we may desire, such as our relatives, friends, &c. how can we pray in faith?

To these two points we shall briefly advert. And to the first, it may be replied that we are taught to pray for food, raiment, health, &c. for ourselves and others, not expecting, nor taught to expect, that the laws of nature are to be changed, suspended, or new-modified, or that we are to become the subjects of any supernatural aid in obtaining these things. But to teach us our dependence, to cause us to exert ourselves in all lawful and reasonable endeavors for the attainment of what is needful, and in case of the failure of these means that God, whose agents are not only the elements of nature, but ten thousands of thousands of angels and men, may, in his benevolent government of the affairs of men, vouchsafe to us all things necessary to life and godliness. These three objects may all be comprehended in the reasons why God, who knows that we need all these things before we ask for them, has commanded us to ask for them.

God has placed all the producing power in the heavens and the earth, as he has all converting power in his holy oracles. But neither of these systems of means, natural or moral, exist independent of him. Of nature, it is said—"I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth, and the earth shall hear the corn, the wine, and the oil, and they shall hear Jezreel." Jezreel represents the dispersed Israelites. This is a series of the most beautiful *prosopopœias*. The heavens, earth, corn, wine, oil, and the nation, are personified. Jezreel calls for corn, wine, and oil. Then the corn, wine, and oil, call upon the earth for nourishment; then the earth calls upon the atmospheric or celestial influences; and last of all, the clouds call upon the Lord. The Lord hears the clouds, the clouds hear the earth, the earth hears the corn, wine, and oil, and these hear Israel and flow into their storehouses. God and man stand at the two extremes of this system of nature. The bounties of his providence pass through many hands, as the law passed through ranks of angels before it came into the hands of Moses. As he created and sustains all, so he presides over all; and therefore, while we call upon him for any favor for ourselves or others, we expect not that he will work a miracle to confer it, but that in subordination to these established arrangements he will bestow it.

Whatever is beyond this is matter of pure faith. Thus if God has promised any special succor to any person, for any purpose, we know

he has classes of intelligent and voluntary agents, who are *all ministering spirits* sent forth to minister for the heirs of salvation, and with a reliance upon his promise and a knowledge of his means and agencies, we confidenty expect the blessing promised.

We know not how the attention of men is fixed upon a thousand subjects, nor by what means, curious and unsearchable, a thousand thoughts arise in our minds. Like ancient Israel, we can trace matters to the clouds; but beyond the clouds, and beyond the three heavens of the Jews, what intellect can pierce!

Besides, there is the *moral* as well as the *natural* government of God. They are not the same, though the latter may in many respects be analogous to the former. Minds, or rational agents, are not under the government of only the same laws which govern our bodies. If the universe had been altogether material, its creator might have slept for seven thousand years, to speak after the manner of men, and on awaking have found things just as the evolutions of natural law would have presented them. But minds require supervision; because, all nature is an immense manufactory of motives, which are constantly operating in all directions, upon every thing that thinks, in the universe. But there we approach the shores of that ocean on which no mortal man has made a voyage of discovery; and for us to infer from premises unexplored, is as arrogant as it would be ridiculous to write the details of a voyage round the universe which has never yet been made.

But to descend to the ground on which God's word and government have placed us, we are taught to pray, and taught at the same time that God is unchangeable. We are taught that the word of God is the sword of the Spirit, and that the gospel is both the wisdom and the power of God to salvation; and yet we are taught to pray for all men. But while all converting power is in the word, who can tell the thousand ways in which that word, that great moral instrument, may operate upon the minds of men, or in how many attitudes they may present themselves, or be presented, to its influences! No matter who plants, or who waters, "it is God who makes to grow." But how often does the shower fall on the field of the sluggard; how often does the dew bless the ill-farmed or uncultivated fields of the slothful;—but it fills not his barn. His stalls are empty. He begs in harvest. They only who ply themselves are blessed. The diligent become rich.

But were it not that philosophy has presumed to explain every thing, and to cut the knots which she cannot untie, I would rather have answered your letter in the following style—

God's word is the word of life. Where it is not known, believed, and obeyed, there no life eternal dawns. He that has the Son of God has this life, and he is revealed in this living word. He teaches his disciples to pray for the following things:—For their daily bread; for them that despitefully use and persecute them. Thus, Jesus said, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do"—and Stephen, by the Holy Spirit said, "Lord lay not this sin to their account"—"Lord Jesus receive my spirit." Paul's desire and prayer to God for

Israel was, that they might be saved; and he commanded Timothy to teach the church in Ephesus to pray *for all men:* for kings, and for all in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For as a reason, he adds—"This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, *who will have all men to be saved*, and to come to an acknowledgment of the truth." If any man lack wisdom, says James, let him ask of God who gives liberally and upbraids not, and it shall be given him. But in one general command, a hundred sayings to this effect are comprehended—Phil. iv. 6: "Be anxiously solicitous about nothing; but *in every thing*, by prayer and deprecation let your requests be made known to God, and the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." This is enough for me: how is it for you, brother?

A person who will not pray for the conversion of his children, friends or enemies, because he cannot see how it can be done in conformity to many truths in religion, such as God's immutability, &c. or his views of God's government, oracle, grace, purpose, &c. reminds me of a physician who could not pray for his daily bread because it was incompatible to pray for sickness, or an increase of his practice, and he could not see how his prayer could be answered unless by an increase of the afflictions of men!!

But concerning prayer as a means of communicating the thing sought, or of receiving the blessing desired, a good deal may be said, and with propriety. When Paul commands prayer for kings and governors, that christians might enjoy a quiet and peaceful life, we see that the very fact of offering up these supplications, in public assemblies, would have a tendency to secure the protection of the government. He that prays for the salvation of his children, in their presence, must perceive that it operates both on him to produce more attention to their instruction, and on them, to give more heed to the things commanded. To pray for humility is the shortest and safest means to be humble. To pray for sincerity, goodness, benevolence, love, &c. is the best means to possess them. But God will hear the prayer of the righteous, for his ears are open to their cry. He will answer the prayer of the upright, and when they call upon him he will deliver them. Paul was as much strengthened by his prayers as he would have been by removing the burthen from which he sought deliverance. To increase a person's strength to carry fifty or a hundred pounds, is equivalent to the removing of a burthen of that weight.

A word on praying in faith. We pray in faith, either in reference to general or special promises. For example, God has promised, and has declared himself willing to save all men acknowledging that Jesus is his only Son, and the only Saviour of men. We may therefore pray for all persons coming to Jesus as God's Son. We pray in faith, also, when we pray for any thing the Lord has promised to bestow on them that ask him.

Sometimes, however, we pray without any promise, and without

any testimony; and then we must say, *if the Lord will.* Paul prayed a long time to have a prosperous journey to Rome. This he desired from the Lord. Jesus said, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." This was simply an expression of his desire. So Stephen desired that his martyrdom might not be avenged on them who shed his blood. Paul desired the salvation of his persecuting brethren. It is lawful, useful, and every way compatible, to express these desires to God in prayer. A father may pray for the salvation of his children when he brings them up in the nurture and correction in the Lord. But I see I have not yet exhausted the subject; and as I promised an essay or two on prayer, I think I will risk this letter in part reply to yours as No. 1. I began it, not deciding whether it should be private or public; and as I am much pressed for time, I will, with all its imperfections on its head, let it pass for what it is worth.

In one word, dear brother, there is all the good reason in the world why christians should always pray and not faint; why they should pray without ceasing. What an honor to be permitted to speak to God in the name of his Son! May we prize it as we ought, and may the incense of our hearts always ascend to the heavens!

Yours affectionately, EDITOR.

THE HOLY KISS.

ALL kingdoms, nations, states, tribes, and even small communities have some peculiar manners and customs of their own. These are generally the offspring of circumstances, the result of long secluded intercourse. Like language or dialect, they are the growth of time, and sometimes as unalterable as the provincial pronunciation, gait, or even the features of an individual. These manners and customs principally respect dress, the fireside, the table, the rites of hospitality, feasts, courtship, marriage, salutation, funeral rites, and such like.

The religion of every country gives its tinge to all these. The Jews' religion was more attentive to some of these customs and manners than any other, and hence the people of Israel became more formal than any other nation. Christianity originated no new manners or customs respecting dress, the rites of hospitality, entertainments public or private, courtship, marriage, the rites of sepulture, or even the mode of saluting friends or strangers. This is beneath its sublime character. It stoops not to tell ladies how to fashion their garments nor their head-dresses, but inculcates modest and plain apparel, because of its congruity with the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit. It prescribes no rules for the fireside, the table, the couch, or any of the rites of hospitality; but it inculcates the thing called *hospitality*, and carries it far beyond the circle of friends and relations, even to strangers and foreigners. It prescribes no rules for standing, sitting, or reclining at tables, at entertainments public or private. It says not a word upon some very interesting subjects to many—I mean courtships, marriages, and the nuptial rites. It legislates not

upon kissing, shaking hands, bowing, courtesying, nor even upon the solemn rites due to the dead. But it teaches decency and moderation in every thing: modesty, chastity, purity, and courtesy in all intercourse with society.

Every thing rude, savage, ferocious, and unseemly in the customs and manners of society, wherever it came it softened, mellowed, and refined by its morality and its purity, without passing a law upon the subject. It consecrated and elevated whatever was natural, rational, or even politically good in society, without changing a political maxim or enforcing a single statute. And, what is not a little strange, even in the organization of the christian congregation it took hold of *the order* of the Jewish synagogue, and adopted every thing in it at all analogous to the christian institution, and made it a sort of model of the whole christian economy in the public assembly. Hence the elders, bishops, deacons, and their offices in the christian church correspond in name and function to those in the synagogues. But of this again.

Even when Paul gave orders to the Corinthian church concerning the use of the gifts, especially of tongues and the interpretation of them, he quotes the rule which from the Captivity obtained in the synagogue after the language of the book and the nation became in some respects dissimilar. "Let him who speaks in an unknown tongue in the congregation speak two, or, at most, three sentences at a time, and let one interpret."

"In the synagogues, after the Syriac became the mother tongue, the interpreters stood next the minister, or reader, and translated the section sentence by sentence into Syriac: for in the lesson from the law the reader might not read above one verse at a time before the interpreters explained it; but in the lesson from the Prophets he might read *three* sentences together." This custom exists in many countries to this day.* Jesus read but two sentences from the Prophet Isaiah, in the synagogue of Nazareth, before he began to interpret and apply it. These readings were preceded by prayer, and all the exercises in the synagogue were concluded by a benediction.

But to another item in the synagogue service bearing upon our subject. The manner of sitting in these synagogues was uniform, and the same which all antiquity declares obtained in the christian meetings. Philo the Jew, as quoted by Brown, says, "The portion of the synagogue devoted to the congregation was divided by a partition or lattice of wire work, of three or four cubits high, extending from near the door to the desk, on one side of which sat the men and on the other the women; a division which is said still obtains in the synagogues."

There were no promiscuous compellations or salutations practised among the Jews in their public worship. Now as christianity consecrated usages which obtained among the Jews, and introduced no new customs, it will follow that such a practice as obtains among some

*Brown's *Antiquities of the Jews, vol.* i. 648.

congregations of promiscuous salutations by what is called the *holy kiss*, is unwarranted by both the Old and New Testament, as well as by the customs of our country.

No man can infer from any thing said in the New Testament concerning a *holy* kiss, that it was, even in countries where there was a *common* kiss among males, ever promiscuously practised. And certainly we have no such custom in our times of males and females promiscuously saluting one another in this way, either in the public assembly or from house to house. We ask, is it *comely* for married men in public assemblies, or in the private circles, to kiss the wives of other men, some of their husbands too, perhaps not members of the congregation? and is it not full as uncomely and as wholly unprecedented in the sacred scriptures for young unmarried men, either in public or in private intercourse, to salute with a kiss unmarried women? This is a usage at which all civilized society revolts; and for which we are bold to affirm there is no authority in the Old Testament or New.

Let no man say, in relation to this matter, there is neither male nor female in Christ; for it will not apply. He may as well say there is neither husband nor wife, parent nor child, master nor servant in Christ, and thus demolish all social relations, duties, obligations, &c.

There is nothing, however, in reason nor religion, which can forbid females saluting one another, or males saluting one another when a proper occasion calls for it in this way. But neither is there any thing to forbid their changing or their adopting of any customs or manners touching salutation, courtship, marriage, or funeral rites, if they see proper so to do. But right reason and sacred writ seem to say that it is more expedient to sanctify the manners and customs of our country, than to adopt new ones which neither we nor our fathers practised. But if we go for Jewish usages, let us take them all. Let us make *all* holy and not a *part*. And, indeed, we must say, that if certain manners and customs should designate the christian kingdom all the world over, we know of none more worthy of consecration and universal adoption than the primitive manners and customs of that people. EDITOR.

ECCLESIASTICAL SHAKINGS.

MR. ROSS, says the "*Christian Messenger*," one of the Editors of the Calvinistic Magazine, in co. with Dr. Nelson and Mr. Gallaher of Tennessee, has written an article on *faith according to common sense*. This Presbyterian Doctor has written in the style of common sense. From many good remarks we select the following:—

"What, then, is the *nature* of gospel faith?

"I answer—*It is in its* NATURE *the same state of soul with that of faith, or belief, we give every day to any other subject* WHICH REACHES OUR HEART. The following facts, supplied by the Bible, will support this position:—

"Christ and his Apostles, when they required men to believe, uniformly spoke in such a manner as to show that they knew the requirement was *understood* by their hearers.

"2. Christ marvelled at the *unbelief* of those to whom he preached.

"3. The hearers of Jesus did in fact perfectly *understand* what was meant by faith, or belief.

"If, then, Christ and his Apostles expected to be *understood* when they required men to believe—if the unbelief of men was a matter of *astonishment* even to Jesus, and if all to whom the offer of life was made *did perfectly know* what condition of mind was required of them—then, surely, faith as to its *nature* is no mystery. It is simply what I have said, viz.,—a state of the soul *not different* from belief in any other subject *affecting the heart*. Take one of the commonest facts to illustrate this. Every youth, properly nurtured, *believes* in his father's love. He is, then, (after you have explained to him the fatherly character of God) perfectly prepared to *understand* you when you tell him he ought to *believe* that God loves him. Why is he thus prepared? Answer. He knows what that state of mind termed belief, or faith, is. It is in truth the most common condition of his heart, and any attempt to explain its *nature* would only perplex and confound him.

"If this view of the subject be correct, how useless, and worse than useless, is much that has been written to tell the *peculiar* nature of evangelical faith. All the information the sinner wants is to be told the *truths* he ought to believe —the *object* of faith he needs to know; not what faith is as an *intellectual condition of soul*. His language should be that of the man restored to sight—Who is the Son of God that I may believe on him?

"3. *Is faith the act of man?* I have said it is the same thing in nature with our belief in any other subject *reaching the heart*. Such belief we know to be *our act*. Is the belief of a son in the kind word of his father, his act? Surely. His heart is in it. From the very nature of such a belief, this makes it a voluntary act. So it is in the faith which lays hold upon the promise of God. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Rom. x. It is no *spiritual substance*, but just the act of man.

"Again; faith is the act of man, because God requires him to believe his word under the penalty of eternal death. Faith is the *condition* which man is required to meet? If he obeys the requirement, he lives. If he refuses, he dies. Is this not true? How, then, can faith be any thing else than the act of man?

"The sum of what I believe is, then, briefly this—God through grace *inclines* man by his Spirit. MAN when *thus persuaded*, BELIEVES the gospel. The instrument by which the Spirit accomplishes his work is the *truth*.

"Regeneration is often represented as a "*something*" which the Divine Spirit effects in the soul by his *naked influence*. This "something" has various names applied to it. It is with one that *spiritual substance* before mentioned. Others term it a relish or taste for divine things. It is with this class of theologians *the new holy nature*, or *new heart*. This "something" is supposed to be infused, or implanted, or wrought, or created, (for these and other similar phrases are used) in the soul while it is in a *passive* state. It is said to be a something totally distinct from, and previous to, any act of will; and not only so, but entirely different from any state the soul was before adapted or fitted to manifest."——

[This is a good omen for the Presbyterian church in Tennessee. I hope it may benefit Dr. Jennings of Nashville.]

"If, then, the Holy Spirit accomplishes his work with the truth, we ask in the next place, *how* he causes it to influence the mind? Here, too, we have satisfactory information. The Bible authorizes us to believe that God causes truth to act upon the mind according to its *natural laws*. Observe the very fact that he renews the heart through the truth, tells us that he employs it in its usual nature, unless we are given to understand that he does not so employ it. But there is not a syllable authorising us to think truth is applied in any other way. There is not a word to support the idea that God operates without the truth, and not one to justify the thought that he uses truth in a supernatural manner. Again; God is said to *entreat*, to *beseech*, to *pray*, to *persuade* men to

be reconciled to him; and when sinners, as in the case of Agrippa, *are almost persuaded*, they are besought to be *altogether* persuaded. Hence, when God renews the heart through the truth, and we become not only *almost* but *altogether* christians, what is it but the *persuasion* of truth brought to the desired result? Again; sinners are declared inexcusable, because they will not suffer the truth to enter their minds. Of course, when it does prevail, it enters *just in that way* in which *they* ought to have received it. Again; christians are conscious that divine truth has influenced them according to the ordinary laws of truth, and in no other way."

[I could give many excellent sayings of this sensible gentlemen on the subject of faith; but these evince the current of his soul.]

From the same work we extract the following shakings in the temple of orthodoxy:—

"CHARGES

Exhibited against Mr. Barnes, Minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, with a few extracts from Mr. Barnes' answer.

1. He makes no mention of the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith.
2. He contemptuously rejects the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin.
3. He intimates that the first moral taint of the creature is coincident with his first moral action.
4. He denies that Christ sustained the penalty of the law, and employs language on the subject highly derogatory to the character of Christ.
5. He boldly affirms that the atonement of Christ had no specific reference to individuals.
6. He declares that the atonement, in itself, secured the salvation of no man, and possessed only a conditional efficacy.
7. He maintains that the entire inability of the sinner for holy actions consisted in indisposition of the will; and finally, he declares his independence of all formularies of doctrine, notwithstanding his professed adherence to them.

The atonement secured the salvation of no one, except as God has promised his Son that he should see of the travail of his soul, and except on the condition of repentance and faith.

I assume the free and full offer of the gospel to all men, to be one of those cardinal points of the system by which I *guage* all my other views of truth. I hold no doctrines—and, by the grace of God, never can hold any, which will be in my view inconsistent with the free and full offer of the gospel to all men; or which will bind my hands, or palsy my tongue, or freeze my heart, when I stand before sinners to tell them of a dying Saviour.

It is supposed that it is an evident reflection on the Deity, of a most serious nature, to say that he has required, under the penalty of eternal vengeance, that of man, which he has in no sense power to do.

The great principle on which the author supposes the truths of religion are to be preached, and on which he endeavors to act, is, that the Bible is to be interpreted by all the honest helps within the reach of the preacher; and then proclaimed *as it is*—let it lead where it will, *within* or *without* the circumference of any arrangement of doctrine. He is supposed to be responsible not at all for its impinging on any theological system; nor is it to be cramped by any frame-work of faith that has been reared around the Bible.

It must be acknowledged that the Presbytery had some reason for alarm at the avowal of such a doctrine as that advanced in this last extract. A preacher to interpret the Bible by all the honest helps within his reach, lead where it will; and not be cramped by any frame-work of faith! The "Confession" was in danger. The authority of Presbyteries and Synods, and "the General Assembly," was presumptuously questioned. No wonder Mr. Barnes was assailed and condemned. He, however, found friends. The decision of the Presbytery was carried up to the Synod, and thence to the General Assembly,

which disposed of the matter by a sort of compromise, as stated in a late Register. The division is not healed. It had spread far and wide. Dr. Ely, the editor of the "Philadelphian," having supported Mr. Barnes, a new paper was established under the name of the "Presbyterian:" the two papers may be considered the representatives of the two parties in the Presbyterian Church, and whenever occasion shall be given to renew the strife, there can be no doubt that they will speak in tones that will shake the walls of a union, which policy, far more than a common faith, has cemented. G.

STATISTICS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

THE number of men, from 15 to 60 years of age, is 1,244,867, or about 4 to every 17. There are about 90,000 marriages yearly; and of every 63 marriages 3 only are observed to be without offspring. The deaths of every year are about 332,700; every month, 25,592; every week, 6,398, every day, 214; every hour, about 40. The proportion of the deaths of women to those of men is as 50 to 54. Married women live longer than those who are not married. In the country places there are, on an average, four children born of each marriage; in cities and large towns, the proportion is seven to every two marriages. The married women are, to all the female inhabitants of the country, as 1 to 3; and the married men to all the males, as 3 to 5. The number of widows is to that of widowers, as 3 to 1; but of widows who re-marry to that of widowers, as 4 to 5. The number of old persons who die during cold weather is to those who die during a warm season, as 7 to 4. Half of all that are born, die before they attain 17 years. The number of twins is to that of single births, as 1 to 65. The greatest number of births is in February and March. The small pox in the *natural way* usually carries off 8 out of every 100 it attacks; by inoculation 1 dies out of every 300. The proportion of males born to that of females, is as 26 to 25. In the sea-ports, there are 132 females to 100 males; and in the manufacturing towns, 113 females to 100 males.

LONDON, on the river Thames, is ten miles long from East to West, and six and a quarter broad, from North to South, and fifty miles in circumference. Its population is 1,500,000. It contains 70 squares, 800 streets, 177,000 houses, 146 parishes, as many churches, 82 chapels of Ease, 15 Roman Catholic chapels, 6 synagogues, 7 Quaker chapels, 153 Dissenters' chapels, 13 Theatres, 4 Medical Colleges, 33 Hospitals, 72 Banks, besides numerous other public institutions.

PARIS is four and a half miles long, about three and a half broad, and seventeen in circumference. It contains 750,000 inhabitants, 12 Mayoralties, 12 Palaces, 16 Bridges, 27 Hospitals, 67 Banks, 142 Churches and Chapels, 80 Fountains, 22 Markets, 4 Museums, 9 Prisons, and 14 Theatres, besides numerother public buildings.

CONSTANTINOPLE is built on seven hills. On the land side it has a strong wall and tribe fortifications, eighteen feet apart, five gates and as many bridges. The fortifications on the side of the river are weak and decaying; on this side are sixteen gates. Its circumference is from twelve to fourteen miles. Its population, 550,000—houses, from 40 to 45,000. It has 300 Mosques, 35 Greek Churches, 130 Baths, and 200 Palaces and Seraglios. The Sultan's Palace, said to be the most splendid in Europe, is three miles in circumference.

CANTON.—It is said that Shoemakers form the most numerous class of operatives in Canton; the number is estimated at 25,000. Of Weavers, there are about 15,900. Of Lapidaries, there are upwards of 7,000. The Carpenters and Cabinet-makers are estimated at 16,000. There are above 17,000 trading boats of different sizes, which pass along the river from Canton to Whampoa. The tanka, or small boats, in which people live, and which pay an annual fee to the police, are said to be upwards of 50,000.

N. Y. Gazette.

☞Brother WALTER SCOTT, who, in the Fall of 1827, arranged the several items of Faith, Repentance, Baptism, Remission of Sins, the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life, restored them in this order to the church under the title of *Ancient Gospel*, and successfully preached it for the conversion of the world—has written a discourse on the fifth point, (viz. the *Holy Spirit*,) which presents the subject in such an attitude as cannot fail to make all who read it understand the views entertained by us, and, as we think, taught by the Apostles in their writings. We can recommend to all the disciples this discourse as most worthy of a place in their families, because it perspicuously, forcibly, and with a brevity favorable to an easy apprehension of its meaning, presents the subject to the mind of the reader. Our opponents, too, who are continually misrepresenting, and many of them no doubt misconceiving our views on this subject, if they would be advised by us, we would request to furnish themselves with a copy, that they may be better informed on this topic; and if they should still be conscientiously opposed, that they may oppose what we teach, and not a phantom of their own creation. A discourse of this sort, detached from other matters, written with so much clearness, point, and energy, we deem better calculated to put this subject to rest than a more elaborate treatise upon it.

The price will be 25 cents each, or 5 copies for one dollar.

Brother Scott wishes, before the second edition is put to press, to ascertain the number of copies he ought to strike off. Orders from our Agents or others, addressed to this Office, will be attended to. EDITOR.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

G W Trabue, Glasgow Ky. paid vols 1 & 2 for T Crenshaw, J W Davis, J Terry, and himself; vol 1 for P R Haley, and vol 2 for W A Bush, W Ritter, J Eubank, jr. J W Scrivner, S P Baudery, P J Kirtly, Z Huggins, W S Jones, F McMillin, W Logan, Sen. and J Trabue. A Kirkpatrick, Meigsville Ten. vol 1 for J Draper, vol 2 for P Mulkey and himself, and $1 for vol 3 for N Fisk. J Clingan, Wooster O. vol 1, and $1 for vol 2. R Scott, Rhinebeck N. Y. paid for seven subscribers. B S Hendrickson, New York City, vol 1 for W Thompson, and vol 2 for J Ovington, L Whitmore, and himself. G W Elley, Nicholasville Ky. vol 2 for J Higby and J Atwood. A Anderson, Mt. Pleasant Va. vols 1 & 2. T Thompson, Columbia Mo. vol 2 for W Jewel, O Parker, R Cove, J H Burnett, and S J Readman. T Brewster, Ellias Village N. Y. vols 1 and 2. W Delany, Dublin Hall O. vol 2. E B Hubbard, Deerfield O. vol 2 for P Hartzell, J Hartzell, A A Hubbard, H Rogers, A Alleston, and himself. J Gaston, Augusta O. vol 2. M Sackett, Canfield O. vol 2. W Pangburn, Middlebury O. vol 2. S Foster, Windham O. vol 2. J Rudolph, Garrettsville O. vol 2 for S Rider, J Noah, P Allen, S Sanford, and S Robbins. J Marshall, Knoxville O. $1 for vol 2. L Pebles, Charlestown O. vol 2. J Glenn, Noblestown Pa. vol 2. D Doughton, Hubbard O. vol 2. T Hosford, Brookfield O. vol 2. W Ring and J Millason, Ring's Mills O. vol 1. J Jackman, Ohioville O. vol 2 for J Stephenson. J Calvin, Palmyra O. vol 1. D Danrough, Hudson O. vol. 2. D Wilson, Paris O. vol 2. W Shakespeare and S Halsey, Palmyra O. vol 1. J Lydick, Indiana Pa. $1 for vol 2 for S Howe. J G Ellis, Dry Creek Ky. vol 2 for J Terrill. D Hughes, Old Court House Mi. vol 1 for Sarah Foster, and vol 2 for W Woodall. J F Dufour, Vevay Ia. vol 2 for J Short. S Young, Centreville Mi. vol 2 for J Meek, A Wiles, and T Sellers. D Rounds, Ellesbury N. Y. vol 2. W P Reynolds, Manchester Vt. vols 1 & 2 for E Bresee, R P Conant, D Carver, Mr Preston, and G Bradley. T Worth, Hickory Pa. vol 2. P Marshall, New Orleans La. vols 1 & 2. W E. True, New Castle Ky. vol 2 for M M Jones, H C Tureman, and S Holloway. M P Wills, Fulton Mo. vol 1 for G Maupin, vol 2 for M Miller, and $1 for S Hopson. J McLogan, Newbury N. Y. vols 2 & 3. H Brown, Dublin Hall O. vol 1.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{ No. 11. } BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1831.* { Vol. II. }

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

REBAPTISM.

MR. ANDREW BROADDUS somewhere in his pamphlet asked the question, "How are the baptized to obtain remission of any sins which may be committed after baptism—must they be rebaptized as some have been?" This question we answered not in our Defence of the Extra, because we knew that both the writer and the reader understood full well its impertinence to the question at issue; and because in proposing such a question our friend Broaddus could expect no other information than what he already possessed on this matter. He knew that *christians* have an Advocate with the Father, and if they sin and confess it, and sue for pardon through their Advocate, it is promised. But the making a question of this sort, if it were not to throw dust in the eyes of his reader, indicates a gross misapprehension of our views of Peter's command to the Pentecostian converts.

Baptism is no where proposed as an expiatory rite. He that regards it as such—he who goes to the water as a Jew to the altar, and is baptized *merely* to obtain the remission of his sins, mistakes the whole matter.

I have never heard of any person being baptized for the remission of sins committed since his first baptism, as the case is made out by our querist; but I have heard of some who were once baptized into Christ, and who in faith were buried and raised with the Lord, and had understandingly assumed him as their Saviour; not, however, having special regard to remission of sins in their baptism; I say, I have heard of some such being rebaptized—not for the purpose of being immersed into Christ, into his death, or of assuming him as their Saviour, but solely for the remission of their sins, that they might have the testimony of God assuring them of pardon. Of such cases we have heard. But how many honest and well disposed persons have been mistaken in their reasonings, and how many have acted in all great matters more from the impulse of the moment, than from calm and sober reflection!

Their argument appears a very specious one when regarded only in one point of view. One says, '*Was I ever baptized for the remission of my sins!* No, I reflected not on the matter; I had no special

attention to the promise of remission. Indeed, I thought I had the remission of my sins through faith before I was baptized; and, therefore, expected it not at that time. I wished to obey the Lord, and obtained the answer of a good conscience that the Lord then approved me; but so soon as I saw that remission of sins was promised to be conferred through immersion, I concluded (to make the matter sure) to be immersed a second time, solely to obtain an assurance that I was forgiven. I found this assurance, and since I have been more happy than before.' Such experiences I have heard. Others, however, have told me that they had no more happiness nor assurance after the second, than they had after the first immersion, for then they had all peace and joy in the Lord.

This is the case fairly made out, as far as I am informed upon the subject. It appears, indeed, that this was making baptism a mere expiatory rite, and regarding it as designed alone for ablution. It made void the former baptism, not because the subject did not believe and confess that Jesus was the Messiah the Son of God—not because the subject was not intelligently immersed into Christ, and did not constitutionally put him on, being, according to the commandment, immersed on said profession, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and thenceforth admitted into the family of God; but because the subject or the administrator did not fully understand the whole purport of the institution.

As for the peace and assurance which some have obtained by a second baptism, it is easily explained. Let any person think, or imagine, that any act is ordained for any religious purpose, and when he has performed that act he will find peace. Some persons have been rebaptized in order to obtain the gift of the Holy Spirit, and have felt assured that they did obtain that gift, consequent upon their *third* baptism; but this was to be expected from the same law of our nature: for all who think must perceive that good or evil tidings, whether true or false, if only regarded as true, will operate upon the heart according to their nature; so of the objects of hope, joy, or any of the affections. It is only, however, when the hope, joy, or peace arises from the testimony of God, apprehended and embraced, that it can be permanent, or ought to be regarded as genuine. All true joy, peace, and hope must be resolved into truth. There is false joy, peace, and hope when the causes are imaginative or false.

I trust we need not attempt to show that Jesus Christ has not ordained any institution solely for the remission of sins—any rite or observance for expiation. Remission of sins is, indeed, connected with baptism; but so is adoption, sanctification, and all the blessings of the new institution. The salvation of the soul, which comprehends every thing which can be enjoyed in this present world, is attached to it. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved. To be baptized for the remission of sins exclusively, is not what is meant by putting on Christ, or by being immersed into Christ. No person, intelligent in the christian religion, can be baptized for the remission of his sins apart from all other blessings. For one, then, that has been born again,

born of water and of the Spirit, one who has been baptized into Christ, confessing his faith in the person, character, and mission of Jesus, to be baptized a second time for the remission of sins by itself, or for the Holy Spirit by itself, or for any one blessing, is without command, precedent, or reason from the New Testament.

Besides, no person can be born twice to come into the same kingdom. The first birth introduces us into the kingdom of nature; regeneration, or being born of water and the Spirit, brings us into the kingdom of grace; and being born from the grave will introduce us into the kingdom of glory. *No man can be born twice into one and the same kingdom.*

How a person who has been born again and entered the kingdom of grace, can die in that kingdom, and be buried in that kingdom, and be born a second time into it, is not for me to explain. There is but one baptism, and but once baptism under the Christian King. Indeed, I know not how any proclaimer of the gospel, how any intelligent disciple, can presume to bury a living disciple; [it is against the law!] how he can immerse a believer a second time into Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He must have received a new commission. The old apostolic commission authorizes it not. I know some will say that the candidates which they immersed a second time did not rightly understand baptism the first time. Well, I am persuaded they did not understand it the second time; and shall they be baptized a third time! But did all the believers whom the Apostles baptized understand their baptism in all its designs, meaning, and bearings. We presume not, else the Apostles need not have written to them to explain it: "Know you not," said Paul to the Romans, "that so many of us as were immersed into Jesus Christ were immersed into his death." But did Paul command any one to be baptized a second time, because he did not fully understand the whole import of his baptism? Did Peter command Simon to repent and be baptized again for the remission of his sins? If any person ought to have been rebaptized, it was this Simon the sorcerer. But no such idea is suggested any where in the New Testament.

But were not many of John's disciples baptized again? Not one of them was baptized twice into John's baptism; but some of them were once baptized into Jesus Christ. John baptized not into the name of the Lord Jesus, but into reformation, saying that "his disciples should believe in him that was to come after him." There is neither precedent nor analogy to support this practice.

In political regeneration how is it? A German desirous of holding an estate in fee simple, is naturalized. He understood that no foreigner can hold an estate in fee simple, being an alien. He was born again, or naturalized. This was all he desired and expected. But an election draws nigh: he hears the citizens talk of voting. He never thought of this at the time of his naturalization. He wishes to vote as a citizen. Must he be naturalized again? He need not. He cannot.

A Frenchman migrates to the United States. He is a republican in principle. He desires to become a citizen purely because he ap-

proves and loves the government, or the political institutions. He thinks about nothing but the adoption of the constitution, and the renunciation of monarchy forever. After some years he wishes to be a legislator, to be a candidate for congress. Of this he had neither knowledge, expectation, nor will at the time of his regeneration. Must he be regenerated again? No: the right to vote and to be voted for, the right to hold the soil, the right to be a magistrate, legislator, or judge, was all secured in the act of naturalization. These are, at least analogies, as far as suits this subject, and may illustrate the idea that every birth secures to a person all the immunities, rights, and privileges of the kingdom into which he is born, whether he distinctly understand them or not at the time of his introduction.

In all covenants all the items of the covenant are secured to the person on the confirmation of the covenant. It is so in the marriage covenant, the national covenant, and the new covenant of our Lord Jesus Christ. And here we cannot but use another interjection. How can any person who constitutionally ever received the cup of the Lord with these words, "This is the new covenant, or institution, in my blood, shed for you," persuade himself to go out of the covenant to disbelieve these words, to disfranchise himself, to make himself an alien, in order to be introduced a second time, to secure some one blessing in that covenant which he did not regard at the confirmation of it!

Such a one resembles an over-squeamish husbandman who covenanted for a farm, and obtained a deed according to law, securing to him all the premises, with all the appurtenances thereunto belonging. After living some years upon it, he discovered a gold mine. He then reasons with himself, saying, 'When I covenanted for this farm I had respect only to the soil and the improvements upon it, together with its situation, &c. but never thought of buying a gold mine. I will go and purchase the farm over again; or rather, I will have the covenant renewed with this specification, that I shall have a right to work said mine for the interest and behoof of my family.'

While on the road to find the other party in the covenant he meets with a friend to whom he relates the whole matter. His friend, better acquainted than he with the nature of covenants, asks him to show him the deed. He does so. 'Why neighbor,' says he, 'you have not read or attended to all the clauses in this instrument! Do you not observe that "*all the appurtenances thereunto belonging*" are secured to you with the soil itself?' 'I never perceived it,' replied the honest swain; 'but now I see it, and regret that I did not sooner discover the gold mine; and when I did discover it, that I did not understand that I had a right to enjoy it. It would have saved me much labor for the years that are past, and would have relieved my mind from many anxieties.'

To as many as received Jesus he gave the privilege of becoming the children of God. In constituting them children he bestowed upon them all the privileges of children of God, made them heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ. Few understand all that is comprehended in

this; but every new discovery does not render all the past void, nor make it necessary to be born again. And he that insists upon a person being rebaptized in order to fellowship, makes his own inferences a bond of union, and adds to the commandments written in the book.

But my friend Broaddus knows full well that we teach no such doctrine; but if a christian errs from the good ways of the Lord we exhort him to *repent and pray*—not to repent and be baptized again; but to confess and forsake his error, and through the Divine Advocate he will find mercy and forgiveness.

He must also perceive from our defence of the Extra, if he have not before, that we do not insulate the remission of sins as the only blessing connected with baptism, nor as the only thing necessary to salvation; but, with his own confession of faith, as well as the Westminster, we regard baptism as securing to the believing subject all the blessings of the new covenant, and especially the remission of sins, on which we *emphasize* when we address penitents, or those who make baptism a mere ceremony. EDITOR.

REASON EXAMINED BY INTERROGATORIES—*No. I.*

REASON, what art thou? What dost thou know of thyself? Art thou a faculty—an organ—or the name of a mere action of a thinking being? Art thou a substantive—a verb—concrete or abstract? Say, art thou the mind's eye—ear—hand—or the mind itself? Canst thou originate any thing, or dost thou compare, weigh, measure, and decide things created, originated, and furnished to your hand? I know not what to call thee, nor what to ascribe to thee. Thy worshippers are so numerous, I fear their proscription and anathema; and yet so divided, I know not to what sect I ought to pay my homage. Some make thee every thing, and some make thee nothing. Some say thou art a creator, some say thou art but a creature, and some make thee neither creator nor creature, but an *ideal* thing, which has neither substance, attribute, nor accident; without nature, name, or habitation; a phantom, an *ignis fatuus*, like conscience, (thy twin sister,) another name for education!

In this musing soliloquy style I talked with myself, as simpletons are wont to do, and Reason made me no answer. Indignant at her silence I determined to put her to trial by torture, and shall now disclose what I compelled her to acknowledge. I asked her, could she prove any thing, even her own existence? Could she prove there is a God, or there is not? Could she prove that he had spoken to man, or that he had not; and if he have, that the Bible contained his communications, or that it did not?

After much compulsion and many denunciations, she very laconically and quaintly asked me, 'Can your eye prove that it exists, unaided by any thing apart from itself? Can it prove that it sees by arguments drawn from itself? Can it see itself, or can it see any thing by itself alone? Is seeing in the light, or in the eye? Is seeing, or the eye, the man, or a part of the man? Tell me,' said she, 'are you con

scious of any thing; and can consciousness prove itself to itself, or to any thing else? Torture me not, unless you will submit to torture also. But if you will patiently wait upon my responses, I will give you a history of myself.

'I am neither seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, nor feeling. I am neither perception, reflection, memory, imagination, nor judgment. I am neither love nor anger; faith nor hope; joy nor sorrow; passion nor affection; appetite nor propensity: but I am Reason! I compare and decide, and yet am neither comparison nor decision: judge and elect, yet am neither judgment nor election: I was, *jure divino*, monarch of the senses, faculties, taste, passions, and affections, though under certain limitations and restrictions. I was once the absolute faculty of faculties; but now I am but a faculty in company with others, restricted, limited, and sometimes controlled by these which ought always to have been my servants—never my masters. My mandates are seldom obeyed at all, often resisted, and never yielded to but with opposition, murmurings, protests, and appeals.

'I have almost said that I am a *faculty;* but this is because of the barrenness, or rather teeming luxuriance of language. We have the faculty of speech, of hearing, of memory—of every thing intellectual and physical. We seldom abuse language so far as to say we have the faculty of loving or hating, though we approximate near those high latitudes when the wind and sea run high. But I stand in the inward man, in relation to all other faculties, pretty much as the eye to all the senses in the outward man; and, compared to the organs of the body, I am the hand of the soul. Make me the eye and the hand, or unite in your conceptions of me the attributes of the eye, und the hand, and you begin to conceive of me aright. As the eye discovers the relations of things, their magnitude, attitude, distance, proportion, color, &c. and as the hand arranges and disposes of the things within its reach; so I perceive the agreement or disagreement of ideas with things, and their mutual relations; and I arrange and dispose them in such order as to suit my designs with respect to myself and every other faculty, passion, appetite, or propensity in man.

'But call me a *faculty* until a better name can be found, and regard me only as a faculty whose exercises are bounded and circumscribed like the eye or the ear—like the memory or the imagination. But as the eye cannot see without light, or exercise itself without objects; as the hand cannot dispose, arrange, or accommodate things, unless they are within its reach; so I can do nothing without ideas. These I can examine, compare, and arrange; but I must first possess them. I am, therefore, younger than perception, younger than memory, younger than sensation; indeed, I am the youngest of the whole brotherhood of faculties which belong to man. The infant sees, hears, smells, tastes, feels, and perceives through these senses, reflects, remembers, before I am born, or before it reasons. As the Lord made not man until he had prepared a world for him, so I am not called into existence until there is in the magazine of the human soul something for me to work upon.

'The principles of reason, unless the phrase means *the laws which govern me*, is a phrase without any meaning. There are no principles of memory, of seeing, of hearing, nor of reason. Men have made me an Argus, a Proteus, a Centaur—any thing and every thing; but I am only a mere faculty, a power which belongs to man. I can prove nothing; but I can decide upon the pretensions of every thing claiming to be true or real. But this I can do only by the assistance of my fraternity, the faculties of the human understanding, and by my cousins *the Five Senses*. Take away or impair the outward senses, or the objects on which they act, and I am like Sampson shorn and his eyes extinguished.

'I am a friend to *Faith*, and always lend her my hand in comparing, examining, and deciding upon testimony. But when Faith becomes intoxicated with the gas of enthusiasm, I permit her to take her own course, and make it a rule to aid her in nothing unless she ask my aid.

'I am also a friend to *Revelation*, and always vote for her at the polls. I only, however, decide upon her pretensions and upon the meaning of her words. She permits my interference, she solicits my aid no farther; and, indeed, this is all I am able to do for her.

'I have many very ignorant, but enthusiastic adorers. They make me ashamed by the fanaticism of their adulation, and put me to the blush by the extravagances of their eulogies. I have been much injured by the hypocrisy of many of my devotees; but more discredited by the hyperboles of my most sincere, but mistaken admirers. Some of them confound me with Experience and Observation. One says he can, by my aid, prove that an acorn will, under certain circumstances, become a tree, and that this tree will produce an acorn. Another says that by my aid he will prove that heat is necessary to animal and vegetable life; and that without moisture neither animal nor vegetable can exist. Thus he confounds me with his eyes and his memory, or with his own observation. He might as well say he will prove that he sees by his ear, or that he will prove that he hears by his eye.

'Many deify me, and give me the power of creating the ideas which I compare and arrange; and others, detecting these absurdities, say I am good for nothing, an *ignis fatuus*, a nonentity; and yet I am as sinful as Satan. They call me *carnal*, and will not allow me to interpret a word in the Bible, or to examine an idea which they call *spiritual*.

'Thus, betwixt my friends and my enemies, I lead a miserable life. At one time I am God—at another, Satan. Now I am able to prove every thing—then able to prove nothing. Again, I am above every thing human or animal, and anon every thing is above me. I claim neither legislative nor executive power in any government. I belong to the judiciary. Give me a seat among the judges, and make me independent of the caprices of men, and I will give a faithful verdict according to the law and the testimony in the case. Such are my pretensions; and farther than this deponent saith not upon the first interrogatory. But on the other specifications I beg leave to be heard again.'

EDITOR.

ON THE LAWS OF INTERPRETATION.

NO. I.

A MORE essential service, in our judgment, no man can render the present generation, than to call the attention of the readers of the Sacred Scriptures to the standard rules of interpretation. We are daily more deeply convinced that the confusion, ignorance, enthusiasm, and superstition of this generation are attributable more to false principles, or, perhaps, to the lack of all principles of interpretation, than to all other causes combined. It is the teachers that cause the people to err more in this respect than in any other. One says the Bible means what it says; another says it means not what it says. One denounces the literal, another the spiritual meaning of the book. One is all for the spirit, another all for the letter; and some are always in quest of the recondite and hidden meaning. Thus the people know not by what star to steer their course, and are in worse circumstances than if they acknowledged no other guide, overseer, or ruler, than plain, honest common sense.

Commentators are as much to blame for this confusion as the sermonizers. All, with a very few exceptions, have a system of religion already perfected before they undertake the interpretation of the book, and that decides more than all the rules of interpretation the true meaning of *the words* of the book.

Demosthenes, Cicero, Tacitus, Homer, Horace, Virgil, can be translated, commented on, and with the exception of some allusions to ancient places, persons, and customs, universally understood by all readers, and with the most exact concurrence in almost every sentence. How comes this to pass? Were they more familiar, plain, and intelligible writers than the Evangelists and Apostles of Jesus Christ? Are the flights of Homer, the fancies of Hesiod, the odes or satires of Horace, the Æneid or Georgics of Virgil, the orations of Demosthenes or Cicero, less figurative, more perspicuous than the pleadings and preachings of Jesus, of Paul, of Peter, or of John? All christendom will respond, *No.* Have not these writings of the Greeks and Romans passed through as many hands, come down through as many generations as the writings of the One Volume? Most of them are of higher antiquity than the New Testament, and most of them have been translated into many languages, and read by an equal proportion of educated readers in all generations, with the exception of the present and one or two centuries back. Why is it, then, that a concurrence so general, an agreement so universal obtains in regard to the meaning of these poets, philosophers, orators, and historians, and so great a discrepancy, so general a disagreement as to the meaning of these sacred writings? The secret is this: All writers, commentators, and critics upon the classic authors of Greece and Rome are governed by the same rules of interpretation, and expect to find the sense by the aid of dictionaries, grammars, geographies, and histories pertaining to the countries, times, and languages in which these books were first written. And when translated, the reader of the transla-

tion, except through the use of the dictionary and grammar, or if he understand not the system called grammar, the current usage of the words which has obtained in his mother tongue, expects not to understand them; and by these alone he hopes to come at the meaning. In this course, too, all who make a rational effort arrive at the full assurance of understanding.

Not so the readers of the sacred writings. Grammars, dictionaries, geographies, and contemporary historians are regarded as *carnal* weapons, and the meaning of the words as mere *letter*—of no account in arriving at the true meaning. A person will be ridiculed by a Quaker, mocked by a Swedenborgian, and denounced by some Calvinists for presuming to understand the "true doctrine" of the Bible by the aid of such means and rules as enable him to understand any other book. The very reason which he employs, and to which God speaks, is called natural or *carnal* reason; and the person who presumes by such means to understand these writings is a mere natural man, without the Spirit, and without religion. Some person must bear these reproaches, or the world will continue to grope on in the dark three hundred years behind itself in every thing else, and I know not why we should not bear a part of this reproach.

We do not, in saying this, make light of the Spirit of God. And, indeed, we discover that the more intelligent of all societies abandon their own system of spiritual aids when they come to defend the common or any other version of the Bible. They draw their first argument from the number, erudition, and talents of the translators. I have not met any person so visionary as to pretend to think that the Spirit of God ever aided a translator in finding the meaning of a word in the dictionary, in determining the propor application of a rule of grammar, or in revealing the import of any allusion to any geographical, historical, or political facts or things. None pretend that his translation was perfected by the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Now if the Holy Spirit aided not the translator, he surely aided not the commentator nor the sermonizer in finding out the meaning of what is written: for surely all will agree that the work of a translator is incomparably more important, more useful to mankind, than the work of either the commentator or the sermon-maker. All depends upon the translation, and nothing but the ordinary rules of interpretation which are applied to Zenophon, Demosthenes, or Plutarch, can open a single period of the New Testament to any nation or people. Here we stand upon a fact universally admitted; but, alas! how soon lost sight of in the polemic theology of the day; and what is still worse, in the practical reading and examination of God's book.

Any visionary, dreamer, or enthusiast may exclaim, "You heretic! I am sound in the faith. I have got the spiritual meaning." But, pray, from what copy—the original or the translation? From the translation. Then your guide is better acquainted with English than with Greek, and chose to reveal to you English words rather than Greek words! But here we shall not contend with the mystics nor the spiritualizers. We all agree in one great fact, and that proves all

I ask, and disproves every false system of interpretation; and that great fact is, That all translators, in transferring the Revelation from one language to another, depend upon, and are governed by, the dictionaries, grammars, histories, &c. of the language from which, and of the language into which the translation is made. And by these alone can the ideas be communicated.

I hail one of the signs of the times with more than ordinary welcome, because it is one that augurs much good to the coming generation. The most distinguished men for talents, erudition, and veneration for the Holy Oracles, in all denominations, are awaking to the importance of fixing and working by the established rules of interpretation. It is becoming a favorite saying with even some of the most learned Rabbis of this and other lands, that "*true orthodoxy* is the right interpretation of the words of the New Testament;" or, as expressed by others, "*the doctrine of Christ* is the meaning of the words of the Saviour and the Apostles." I feel myself authorized to marshal Michaelis of Gottingen, Horne of Cambridge, and Stuart of Andover, on this side of the question. But I only name these for their high standing and notoriety. I might add a hundred names of high renown: but the writings of these three will do more to direct the generation to come, than perhaps any other three men in Europe or America. Their reputation for orthodoxy, their literary eminence, their connexion with the most flourishing theological institutions, and the force, vivacity, and elegance of their various writings, omen well on this subject.

I am not to be understood as alleging that the rules of interpretation, or of translation, applied to authors of the same antiquity, did not regard words as having not only different meanings, but different sorts of meanings, such as the literal, figurative, typical, parabolic. All these varieties of meaning are found in the scriptures, and in many other works, ancient and modern. We plead for no special rules for the Bible. We take all the rules necessary for translating or expounding any ancient human composition.

Nor would I be understood as intimating that the doctrine of the New Testament, which is the proper meaning of its words, whether regarded as literal, allegorical, typical, or parabolical, does not exert a moral or spiritual influence upon the mind which understands and believes it. Nor that christians do not receive and enjoy the Holy Spirit promised in the New Institution; that the Heavenly Father will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. This is all true in its place: but this is a different subject, and here we should not have mentioned it but because of the fastidious jealousy of some, and the avowed hostility of others, to any thing and every thing we may say on this subject.

Before introducing these rules, it will be necessary to premise still farther on the various senses of words. To do this with the most effect, we shall examine and apply a favorite saying among the reformers—"*The Bible means what it says.*" This ought to be true of every other book in the world. If any book says what it does not mean,

who shall find out what it does mean? Not by its words. By what then? by some interpreter? But what does he interpret? The words, we suppose. If the words are explained by the Dictionaries and Grammars of the language, they mean what they say; if not, then it is not human language at all. And so the maxim applies equally to all books: for a book that means not what it says, means nothing at all.

But some carry this maxim so far as to say, that there is but one meaning in every passage, and that is the *literal*. Now while we agree that there is but one meaning in every passage, we are not prepared to say that that meaning is always the literal. Take a few examples: Zechariah vii. 12, "Yea, they made their hearts *an adamant stone*, lest they should hear the law." Luke xiii. 32, "Go and tell that *fox* Herod."—John i. 29, "Behold *the Lamb of God* that takes away the sin of the world." None will say that the literal is the true meaning of these phrases. The hearts of the Jews were not *adamant stone*; Herod was not a *fox*, nor Jesus a *lamb*. Many such expressions occur in both Testaments. In these the *figurative* sense is the true meaning. Yet still it must be remarked that the literal import of *adamant stone*, *fox*, and *Lamb*, is virtually the import when used figuratively. It is transferred from a physical to a moral quality. A "*heart of stone*" denotes a *hard* heart; but *hard* is itself a metaphor, equivalent to obdurate, unfeeling: a "heart of *flesh* signifies a tender heart; A "heart of *adamant stone*" means a very hard heart. Herod was very cunning, and Jesus was the innocent and harmless person represented by the atoning lamb of the Jewish Institution.

In the scriptures there are parables, allegories, and types. Hence we have the parabolic, allegoric, and typical sense. This has been called the *mystic*, and sometimes the *spiritual* sense. Mystic comes from a Greek word, μυο, to *shut up*, or *hide*. In allegories and parables the sense is hidden; the mystic import is the sense concealed in the allegory, type or parable. *Spiritual* has frequently been used, of ancient times, to denote this sense. Babylon is *spiritually* called Sodom, and Egypt. But a species of sermonizers, of the school of Origen, or rather of Ammonius Saccas, found out that every word in the book had a *spiritual* sense, and this caused the term *spiritual* to be taken in *malem partem*, and to be discarded even where it might have been tolerable.

When carried so far as to make *Joshua the son of Nun* denote spiritually *Jesus the son of man*, and "seven women taking hold of one man" seven converts coming to Christ, it was full time to lay it aside!

John Cocceius, of Leyden, about two hundred years ago, perfected this system. His fundamental rule of interpretation was this: "The words and phrases of scripture, are to be understood in *every sense* of which they are susceptible;" or, "that they signify every thing which in effect they can signify." He is the parent of a numerous progeny of spiritualizers.

We object not to the allegoric, parabolic, and typical sense; or, to express it in one word, the figurative sense. But we do not expect to

find any other than the literal sense except where figures are used. We shall conclude this introductory essay with a sentence or two from Horne's Introduction, vol. 2, p. 492, and from Mosheim:—

"Although in every language there are very many words which admit of several meanings, yet in common parlance there is only *one true sense* attached to any word, which sense is indicated by the connection and series of the discourse, by its subject matter, by the design of the speaker, or by some other adjuncts, unless an ambiguity be purposely intended."

We could wish that the Quakers, Regular Baptists, and the Wesleyan Methodists, would read twice, if not three times, the following extract from Mosheim, History of the Reformation, vol. 4, p. 296 Speaking of the change introduced by Luther and his coadjutors, he says:—

"All these expositors and commentators abandoned the method of the ancient interpreters," (not fully, I say) "who, neglecting *the plain and evident purport of the words of scripture*, were perpetually torturing their imaginations in order to find out a mysterious sense in each word or sentence, or ever hunting after insipid allusions and chimerical applications of scriptural passages, to objects which never entered into the views of the inspired writers. On the contrary, their principal zeal and industry were employed in investigating the natural force and signification of each expression," (I wish they had been more successful) "in consequence of that golden rule of interpretation inculcated by Luther, *'That there is no more than one sense annexed to the words of scripture, throughout all the books of the Old and New Testaments.'*"

The Westminster Divines sanctioned this, and therefore decided, "*that the sense of scripture is not manifold, but one.*"

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

NO. III.

IN my last, I did not quite finish my extracts, from whence the author contends every one ought to learn the knowledge of the christian religion.

"As to the rest, about which they contest, since they are not so very plain, a religious and pious man may and ought to deliberate concerning them, and *withhold his judgment till they appear more evident to him.* For it is *very imprudent to admit or reject any thing, before it sufficiently appears to be either true or false.** Nor is eternal salvation, in the books of the New Testament, promised to any one who embraces this or that *controverted opinion*, but to *him who heartily receives in his mind, and expresses in his actions*, the sum of the christian religion as we have described it."

* What shall we say of our Baptist brethren who admit they have never read the Christian Baptist, or the Harbinger, and yet meet in council, solemnly condemn Reformers, and recommend the destruction of their religious characters?

"This therefore is the only thing that can justly be imposed upon christians; that they embrace whatever they think is *contained in the books of the New Testament, and obey those things which they find there commanded, and abstain from those things which are there forbidden; if any thing further be required of them as necessary, it is without any authority. For would any fair judge require a christian to believe a doctrine come from Christ, which he does not find in the only faithful and undoubted records, in which all are agreed the revelation of Christ is derived down to us?* Let other doctrines be true; let us take this for granted a little while; they cannot, however, be esteemed true by him who, among the different sorts of christians, follows the middle way, and allows of no certain record of the revelation of Christ, *but the books of the New Testament. Whilst he believes this, nothing else can be justly required of him;* and he will believe this, *till it shall be made appear to him by plain arguments*, that the *knowledge of christianity* is safely to be read some where else, which I believe will never be done."

"If any one, therefore, attempts to take away from christians the books of the New Testament, or to add to them such things as do not appear to be true, we are by no means to hearken to such an one, because he requires that of us which no prudent man will allow, that he should *believe that* which we are not certain of, or *neglect that* which all own to be the sure record of the revelation of the gospel. Whoever imposes any thing upon us, as necessarily to be believed, which we cannot believe, drives us from himself; (think, reader, who does this) because *belief cannot be extorted by force*, nor will any one who fears God, and is a lover of truth, suffer himself to profess what he does not believe, for the sake of another." (Is this principle maintained among the sects of this day? I answer, No.)

But they who differ from this, object, that if every one be left to their own liberty in judging of the meaning of the books of the New Testament, there will be as many religions as there are men, and truth, which is but one, will immediately be oppressed by a multitude of errors. But I think, that before an opinion which is established upon solid arguments be opposed by objections, the foundation upon which it is built ought to be overthrown; because so long as that remains firm, the whole superstructure raised upon it cannot be shaken, as we see here. For if any inconvenience should follow from what has been said, it is nevertheless true, till it be made appear not to be fixed on a firm bottom. But to pass by this now; it is false that the *revelation of the New Testament is so obscure that the sum of the christian religion cannot be truly learned from it, by any one of a sound mind, who is desirous of truth.* It is evident from experience that it may be *truly learned from thence;* for all christians, as has been already shown, agree in the principal parts of it. We have no regard here to a few simple or wicked men, since whole societies of christians who in other respects, out of their too great eagerness of contention, are ready to differ from one another, and to run into the contrary extremes, are here agreed."

"No inconsiderable number of christians at this day contend, that many errors in former ages crept by degrees in among the sects of christians. It must not indeed be dissembled, that many things foreign and unknown to the books of the New Testament, have been added and thrust into the christian theology; whence it is, that the true wheat of the sower in the gospel hath not brought forth so much fruit as it would otherwise have done, had the ground been cleared of thorns and hurtful and unprofitable weeds. Many vices and faults were not only admitted or borne with, but applauded also. Yet was not sound doctrine ever the less safe, whilst the books of the New Testament remained, and whilst christians were endued with common sense; for by this means, very eminent men were often raised up, who corrected the errors and vices of their age, and ventured to oppose the torrent. Thus, according to the promise of Christ, *God hindered the gates of death from prevailing against his church;* that is, did not suffer every society wherein the christian doctrine was preserved entire, to be extinguished; though sometimes they were blended and obscured with foreign and contrary opinions, and sometimes more sincere and pure. Wherefore, (to observe this by the way) unless this doctrine (the New Testament) was really sent us from God, it never would have escaped out of such a deluge of vices and errors, but would at length have been overwhelmed by the changeableness and folly of human nature, and have entirely perished."

"Perhaps some may here object against what has been said, that the divine providence would have better consulted the preservation of christian doctrine, if it had prevented the errors that are and have been among christians, and maintained truth and *constant agreement, which is the companion of it*, among them, by its omnipotence. But it is not for us to instruct God how he ought to direct himself, in the government of human affairs, that they might be better. On the contrary, it is our duty to think that God had very wise reasons for suffering what he did suffer, though we cannot so much as guess at what they are. But if any probable reasons can be given for the things that are done, we ought to believe that God permits those things which daily come to pass, to be done for these, or more weighty reasons."

To make a conjecture from the reason of things, we are above all things sure that the design of God was to create men *free*, and to suffer them to continue so to the end; that is, not so good that they should necessarily continue good always, nor so bad that they must of necessity always submit to vice, but mutable, so that they might pass from vice to virtue, and again from virtue to vice; and this with more or less ease, according as they had longer or shorter time given up themselves to virtue or vice. Such we see the *Hebrew* people of old were, and such were the christians afterwards. Neither of them were drawn by an irresistible force either to virtue or vice, but only restrained by laws, which proposed reward to the good, and punishment to the bad, to which were added by the *divine providence* vari-

ous incitements to virtue, and discouragements from vice; but yet neither of them deprived man of his native liberty, whereby he had a power of obeying or disobeying God, as is evident from experience; for there were always good and bad, though the divine laws prescribed virtue and prohibited vice equally to all. That this would be so among christians, Christ has plainly signified in two parables, the one of the tares which the enemy sowed after the wheat was sown, the other of the net which took good and bad fish alike; by which he signified that there would always be in the church a mixture of good and bad christians; whence it follows, that he very well saw the evils that would always be in the christian church." T. M. H.

The following article, from the "Reformer," has the wrong heading. It is *prosecution for irreligious practices*, not prosecution for religious opinions. Still, however, the remarks of O. P. Q. are just, and admonitory to all sectaries and civil rulers. We do not know what, in the English law, constitutes *blasphemy*. If it be constructive, wo awaits the government that legislates upon constructive blasphemy; but if it be what we understand Mr. Taylor was fined and confined for, the Hospital, or Lunatic's Asylum, would have been more appropriate medicine for such a mind and body—"*Sana mens in sano corpore*"—'a sound mind is usually found in a sound body.'

Ed. M. H.

PROSECUTION FOR RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

A Mr. TAYLOR, in England, has lately been tried on a charge of blasphemy, and sentenced by the court "to be imprisoned two years in the county jail, and to pay a fine of £200, and enter into his own recognizance in the sum of £2500 for his good behaviour, and find two sureties of £250, for the next five years." Mr. Taylor received much the same sentence some years ago. The able and intelligent writer for the *London Morning Chronicle* at Paris, under the signature of O. P. Q. writes as follows on the subject of the above trial and sentence—

"Whilst I offer you our congratulations and sympathy on the progress of the Reform Bill in England, and on the triumphant majority on the second reading, allow me to express our lively regrets at the prosecution for religious opinions instituted by the state, or with its connivance, against Mr. Taylor.

"The prosecution of Mr. Taylor was unwise and unnecessary, and the sentence pronounced against him is excessive and absurd! I will tell you why I say this, and I am much mistaken if you do not agree with me. In the first place, I hold, that in a free country like England, I have the right to believe what I will, and reject what I will; and either to be Deist, Churchman, Catholic, or Unitarian. In the second place, I hold that to have the right of believing, without having the right to propagate my belief, is no more than having the right possessed by every human being, even under the most cruel and despotic governments. Liberty of thought can never be denied by human laws,

but only liberty of action; and the moment I am denied the right of propagating my creed, I am enslaved. Then in the third place, the liberty I claim for myself I am willing to confer on others; and therefore on Mr. Taylor. Nor can I do such injustice to my own creed, as to believe that it will be really injured by the propagation of error. For example—1st, I consider my creed, which is contained in the Old and New Testaments, to be the most rational, philosophical, and perfect system, ever proposed to the consideration or belief of man. I believe that God is its author—for that it is too perfect to be invented by man: and 2d, I consider the creed of Mr. Taylor to be as defective, and as irrational and absurd, as mine is perfect, rational, and divine. And I have therefore, 3d, no sort of fear that in the present enlightened state of society, the system of Mr. Taylor shall be preferred to mine; and, on the contrary, I know it to be a fact that christianity is spreading every year, and every hour of every year; and I should as soon expect to behold the solar system changed by the fiat of some wandering astrologer, as I should to see the christian religion overthrown by the sophistries of this preacher of ignorance.

"Poor Mr. Taylor must die one of these days, and then a decent sort of funeral will be got up for him; and when the founder of the sect is dead, the followers will disperse themselves, and yet christianity will continue to spread from the mountains of the Balkan to the mountains of the new world. We may all be sure of this. Why, then, should we prosecute Mr. Taylor? Why make a madman a martyr, or subject a philosopher to imprisonment? If his system be false, then why fear its propagation? and if it be true, then can we arrest truth by dungeons? When the author of our religion commenced the propagation of christianity, he entered into the synagogues of the Jews, disputed with the doctors, overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and attacked all the prejudices of the age in which he lived. In the end he was crucified, and the wretched murderers of their great and glorious victim shouted with joy, and exclaimed, 'Your king is dead, and your system is overthrown!' But how does experience mock their prediction, and laugh at their momentary triumph! Where is christianity now? Why, every year she is gaining new and bloodless triumphs, and the standard of the cross of Christ is now borne in triumph in the isles of the Pacific, the deserts of Africa, the perpetual snows of the polar regions, where the peace loving Moravians inculcate its doctrines, and live according to its rules; and from north to south, and east to west, the religion of Christ is becoming the religion of the world. Now, what should we desire more than this? Will heaven be defeated by the infidelity of Mr. Taylor, or the spread of christianity be arrested by his Sunday ministrations? No, no—it is only prosecutions and recriminations which can gain votaries to his system, or hearers to his chapel. Thus indeed he becomes a martyr, and I would subscribe to pay the expenses of his defence. Let him preach, let him print, let him publish, and let a christian government show to an anti-christian declaimer, that it can well afford to be generous to the unfortunate, and that it has too much confidence in the re-

ligion in which it believes, to appeal to any other weapons than those of truth, argument, and history.

"I am reminded by this subject of a circumstance which has lately taken place in Germany, at Schwerin, a town in lower Saxony, the capital of the Duchy of Mecklenburg Schwerin. A new sect of "Anabaptists," who in England are not merely tolerated, but contain among them some of the most talented, liberal, and enlightened men of the age, having made its appearance in Germany, the Prince Regent of Schwerin has commanded the magistrates to arrest, without distinction of persons, all those Anabaptists who shall dare to exercise their worship publicly, and convey them all to prison. The fact is that the Anabaptists, having been preaching with zeal against the errors of the national religion, have made many converts. Now there is scarcely a reader of the *Morning Chronicle* who will not exclaim, 'Oh, intolerant Government!' 'Oh, shameful persecution!' 'Oh, horrible Prince Regent of Schwerin!' And they will exclaim justly and truly when they say this. But do you suppose that there is the smallest distinction in the principle of the verdict and sentence against Mr. Taylor, and the decree at Schwerin against the Anabaptists? Not the slightest! The verdict and sentence against Mr. Taylor are founded on the dogma, that no one is to be allowed to attack the religion of the State; and the decree of Schwerin is based on precisely the same absurdity. If you approve the one, you must approve the other; and if Mr. Taylor has no right to teach what the British Government calls his errors in England, why the Anabaptists have no right to teach what the Government of Schwerin calls their errors in Germany! And what then? Why, then there would be an end to the missionary, to the schoolmaster, and to the progress of truth, by means of teaching and preaching. I write thus, because I have not yet read any protest in the liberal journals of England against these prosecutions for religious opinions, and because, when Lords Grey and Brougham are ministers, we expect better principles, and a sounder system of laws and reasoning."

ON PRAYER—No. II.

THOUGH not in sequence of our No. 1, we insert as No. 2 the Essay on Prayer which appeared in the first and second editions of our Hymn Book. Being left out of the third edition, we give it a place in this work, under the article on prayer. We think it necessary still to call the attention of our readers to the contents of this Essay:—

When the human mind is indoctrinated into certain modes of thinking and reasoning, every exercise of the mind in religion is tinctured with the distinguishing tenets which constitute the capital points of the system. So that the refined doctrinal christian thinks, speaks, and acts, in religious matters, as if the divine approbation and the enjoyment of heaven were made to depend upon right opinions or correct speculations on the topics of *revelation.* Hence we find that the zeal for correct sentiments gives a peculiar turn to every act of de-

votion. Baptism, the Lord's supper, the Lord's day, prayer, and praise, in the apprehensions, and in the observance of such christians, are attended on as though our acceptance depended upon the ideas or views which the mind takes of these institutions during the period of time in which we are engaged in them. So far has this matter been carried out in practice, that it is not uncommon to find our favorite points in speculative theology to engross the whole contents of a prayer as well as of a sermon. Men are now taught, both by theory and practice, to confess their whole faith in their addresses to God, as they were wont in other times to confess their sins. Sometimes we hear the terms "*we believe*" as often repeated in a prayer as there are principal articles in our creed;—and it is not uncommon for men when addressing their Creator, to declare to him not only their own views of his character and government, but to contrast their views with those of other men—"God, we thank thee that we do not hold this or that; and that we believe this;"—are often heard in public prayers. And it has become as common to pray the sermon over in the succeeding prayer, as it is to sing it over in a suitable hymn or psalm.

Prayer to God is one of the most interesting, solemn, and exalted exercises which falls to the lot of mortal man. It should be well understood by all christians. To contribute something to this is the design of the following pages. Conceiving that when we have been laboring to purge our psalmody and to improve our religious taste in this branch of devotion, it will not be amiss to make an effort to arouse the attention of christians to their prayers as well as to their songs of praise. Prayer is naturally divided into secret and public, or into individual and social. The Saviour commanded both. He gave promises to both—to him that enters into his closet, and to him who agrees with others touching any thing for which they should unite in their prayers to God. Now with regard to secret prayers, there is less temptation to depart from the true and proper attributes of prayer, than in public prayer: for in secret we are freed from any restraints or inducements growing out of a regard for the opinions and estimation of others. Our wants or desires are merely to be expressed in simplicity, and just according to our actual views and feelings, when we address no ear but that of him who hears in secret.

It is in perfect accordance with that wisdom and goodness every where apparent in the christian religion, that we are so repeatedly exhorted to enter into our closets, and to address our Father in secret, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret. There is no school under the heavens in which the *art of prayer* can be so easily acquired—in which the spirit of prayer can be so fully possessed, and in which the language of prayer can be so fully and perfectly attained—as in the closet, in the fields, or forests, where no human ear can hear, and where no human eye can see us. Besides, no prayers have so much influence upon ourselves as those which are offered up in secret to God. We are then, and we feel ourselves then, in company with God alone. We can tell him what we cannot tell any mortal, the nearest and dearest on earth. We can disclose all our secrets,

unburthen all our griefs, confess all our faults, and pour out all our souls before him. If we are distressed, the declaration of our distresses to him, relieves them; if we are prosperous and joyous, our thanksgivings and acknowledgments to him temper our joys and moderate our rejoicings. Equanimity is not only produced, but always retained, by this heaven-devised appointment. We are prepared for every event when we have come out from the presence of God. But there is every thing in reason, in religion, and in our condition and circumstances, to entice us to the closet, and to allure us into the secret recesses to converse with our Father who is in heaven.

According to our faith in God will be our requests, and according to our confidence in his promises will be our assurance of acceptance with him. When in spirit and in truth we call upon the Lord, our words are well ordered, because they are the words of sincerity—the language of the heart. When we speak from the heart, there is a propriety in our terms, and a pathos in our expressions, which easily distinguish them from all the language of art, and the studied forms of speech. Therefore it is that we improve so much in the style of our prayers when we are much practised in secret prayer. Barrenness in language, and a dry, frigid, and stiff style in prayer, argues that the person is a great stranger to secret communion with God. Besides, no man who has been much or long in the habit of conversing with God, can either be ashamed or afraid to pray in the presence of men; for surely he that is wont to converse with the King, will never want language nor feel himself embarrassed when he speaks in the presence of the King's servants.

Some, no doubt, will urge their own experience against this last paragraph, and will feel that it is incorrect as respects themselves. But before their experience can be regarded as of any weight against a position so plain in terms and so plausible in fact, two things must be fully considered: First, whether they have been only occasionally or habitually—whether at long or short intervals—they have been accustomed to address their Heavenly Father in secret. And in the next place, whether fluency of speech belong to them in any instance on any subject. If fluency of speech belong not to them on other subjects, we do not suppose that habitual secret prayer will give them a fluency of speech, or an appropriateness of terms, which they do not possess, and cannot acquire on other subjects.

Without transcending the bounds of that *love that hopes all things*, we might say that a good number of our public prayers seem to be rather prepared for the ears of men than for the ears of God. There is so much of the studied and set phrase of ordinary and artificial composition in our addresses to the throne of the universe, that there is more apparent concern in the speaker to please the ears of his auditors, than to worship and adore the Majesty of the Universe. He seems more desirous of securing the praise of men for his attainments, than the approbation of the Deity for his sincerity and spirituality. These remarks are not offered with any desire, or with the least intention, to promote or cherish a spirit of criticism on the perform-

ances of others; but to put every one on his guard against temptations to a departure from all that is valuable in prayer—from all that is sacred in devotion—and from all that is pleasing to HIM whose approbation is more to be desired than the smiles of all the universe besides. But I must approach still nigher the subject I have in view, and make some remarks on the matter and manner of our prayers.

Whether it has been from the *manuals* of the church of Rome, from *the common prayer book* of the church of England, or from the *directions* for prayer in the Westminster Confession, I will not now deign to inquire; but so it is, that there appears as great a defection from scriptural usage—as great a departure from right reason in this part of the sacred worship, as in any other of the wise and gracious institutions of Heaven.

These departures from scripture and reason may be classed under certain general heads, among which the following are the chief:—1. Uniformity as respects the subject matter. By uniformity in the matter of our prayers, is meant, a certain methodical and stated expression of the same sentiments and sentences in every address to God. Some people pray in such a monotonous strain of sentences, that after you have heard them twice or thrice, you can always anticipate the next sentence; and if you are obliged to attend upon such prayers for a considerable time, they become perfect opiates to your understanding and senses, and are more to be desired for their *soporiferous* than for their *devotional* powers. Such forms of prayer, (for *forms* they really are) argue that the person is immutably the same in his wants, sins, desires, and thanksgivings; or that he has, by indefatigable industry, made out as many phrases as constitute one prayer of ordinary length, which is to serve him longer than the garments of the Israelites, which did not require a stitch or a patch for forty years. This is one extreme, towards which, on the same side, there are many approximations, which, though not so glaring, are nevertheless as exceptionable. Call upon some of this class to pray, and let the occasion be what it may, you must expect to hear the same sins confessed, the same depravity lamented, the same petitions offered, the same thanksgivings repeated. All the difference between their thanksgivings before or after meals, and their public prayers, is, that the former are shorter than the latter. That in the public assembly, or that by the social hearth, is a long prayer; and that before dinner or supper is a short prayer. This is the effect of bad example or of habit. For what is there in reason or in the sacred writings which could lead a person to think that when dinner or supper calls to give thanks to God for the repast provided, we should break forth into a long confession of the sins of all our lives, a declaration of all our duties, a recital of all our petitions, or even a summary of all our thanksgivings? Can we not rationally and scripturally thank or bless God for the favor before us through Jesus Christ our Lord? Again, when we are called upon to thank God in the morning for the mercies of the night, and supplicate his protection through the day, can we not confine ourselves to what is obviously the design of the exercise? And in the evening

when we are called to thank him for the favors of the day, and to implore his guardian care through the night, can we not confine ourselves to that which immediately enters into the design of our worship?

When persons pray for the sake of praying, it matters not what the subject matter of the prayer may be. And, really, there appear to be many prayers made *for the sake of praying*, having no other inducement to the exercise than a sense of duty. The prayers which flow from nothing else than a sense of duty, are very insipid and irksome things, and might as well be dispensed with altogether. If a person pray evening and morning, either in public or in private, for the sake of keeping matters on a good footing with conscience, his devotion is to him as irksome as the sinofferings of the avaricious Jews; and as useless to others as the counting of beads by the hour, or the hebdomadal repetition of *"Pater noster"* to a person who knows not the meaning of a single word.

We should, when we pray, have something in view, or some special consideration which at the time induces us to the exercise. According to this consideration or design should be our prayer. For example: If we bow the knee to pray in behalf of some afflicted person, our whole address to Heaven should have respect unto the case for which we pray, and every thing incompatible with the case should be omitted for the time. Again: If we are called upon to return thanks for some favor bestowed, that alone should occupy our attention and characterize our address to Heaven on that occasion. If two or three persons first agree to ask for some particular blessing, either for one of the company, for all of the company, or for some absent person or persons, that should be the whole and exclusive burthen of the prayer. If, then, these considerations were regarded in all our prayers, there would be no danger of falling into that unmeaning monotony of expression, and insipid uniformity of matter and manner, so irrational and unscriptural. We should, moreover, possess much more of the true spirit of prayer, and be much more benefited ourselves from our prayers, which is one happy end inseparably connected with the proper exercise of prayer.

Next to a monotonous uniformity of expression, we rank a verbose redundancy in the use of epithets and phrases which swell the period without increasing the sentiment, or exalting the devotion of the soul. Of this sort are all those pompous high-sounding addresses to the Deity, in which the speaker seems to exhaust the whole resources of his vocabulary, and puts his inventive faculties to torture to find out words wherewith to astound the audience, and display his elocution. This defect is more impious than the former; for the person who prays seeks his own glory. If he should plead in excuse that in so doing he edifies his audience, he reckons without his host. When a speaker employs more terms than are necessary to express the ideas he would communicate, he is, instead of edifying, confounding the understanding of his audience. He is wasting their attention, instead of inspiring their devotion. Plain and unaffected language, which does no

more than give scope to the feelings of the heart, is the proper language of public prayer. This is the true eloquence of devotion. When there is no effort of the understanding to be eloquent, when the heart pours forth its desires in terms appropriate, naturally flowing as a gentle stream from a living fountain, then are we cheered and refreshed in waiting upon the Lord. If a person possess but a tolerable fluency of speech, and do not strive to be eloquent, but speak in perfect accordance with his feelings; and if he feel as a christian ought when in the audience of his Creator, he cannot fail to be both pleasing and edifying to all who unite with him in worshipping his God and Father.

Rapidity of pronunciation is the third item to which we would request the attention of the devout worshipper. When we address God at any time, or in any place, either in public or private, great deliberation becomes us well. To speak to God is no light matter. No person can exaggerate the solemnity and deliberation which become us on such occasions. Well did Solomon say, "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God. For God is in heaven, and thou upon earth." But deliberation is doubly necessary in public or social prayer: for if we do not speak slowly it is impossible for others to unite with us. We ought to remember that the design of social prayer is, that others should unite with us in every petition and every thanksgiving. Hence the necessity of giving sufficient time to the company to apprehend the full force and meaning of every word and sentence. I have heard many prayers in which it was impossible for me to keep up with the speaker, or to unite with him. And while I was reflecting on the sentence just finished, he had got to the close of the next one. The subject was then lost, and even the pronunciation of a final AMEN was at random, inasmuch as our judgment could not be fully made up on the correctness of the whole. The whole prayer appeared like the sound of a mighty rushing wind.

To a *rapidity of pronunciation* I would add a *speaking at random*, as another deviation from the standard of propriety. I have often heard, or thought I heard, persons commence a sentence before they knew what they were going to ask. The style or manner, and the apparent indecision of the speaker, led us to suppose that he knew not what to ask while the words were still falling from his lips. If this ever be the case with any christian, repentance and reformation become him well. If at any time we have few petitions to make, let us cease so soon as they are offered. It is better to pause one, two, or three minutes between every petition, than to attempt one at random. We should always have a distinct and full view of what we are going to say before we pronounce a single word. This is necessary when, with due respect, we speak to men. How much more when we speak to *God*. Some appear insensible of the impropriety of this manner. They seem to fear nothing so much as to fail in matter. They advance in a hurry, as if they were anxious to appear fluent, and fly from one thing to another without regard to connexion, and as if with-

out design. It would be well for the religious community—for both teachers and taught—if every public speaker knew when he was done, and would just cease to speak when he had nothing to say. Whether from a desire to say something great, or something better, or to correct something said amiss, I presume not to say; but so it is, that many, both in their prayers and in their preachings, continue to speak a long time after they are done. Our great teacher forbade speaking at random in our prayers, and this should be regarded as an authority without any further consideration, of sufficient weight to put us on our guard against such a practice.

But when these four defects are corrected—when we are perfectly free from the charge of a monotonous uniformity of sentiment and style, a verbose redundancy of expression, a confounding rapidity of pronunciation, a thoughtless speaking at random;—still the weightier matters may be overlooked, misunderstood, and neglected; I mean the proper subject matter of prayer. I would beg leave to propose to the consideration of the devout reader some of the prayers found in the sacred scriptures, for the purpose of coming to correct conclusions on this most important subject—They will be found as follows:—

A prayer of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 23–32—of Moses, Ex. xxxii. 11–13—of David, 2 Sam. vii. 18–20—of Solomon, 1 Kings, viii. 23–53—of Ezra, Ez. ix. 6–15—of Nehemiah, Neh. i. 5–11—of the Levites, Neh. ix. 5–33—of Daniel, Dan. ix. 4–19—of Hezekiah, 2 Kings, 15–19, and xx. 3—of Habakuk, Hab. iii. 2—the disciples' prayer, Mat. vi. 9–13—a prayer of the publican, Luke xviii. 13—of the Lord, John xvii.—of 120 disciples, Acts i. 24–5—of the congregation in Jerusalem, Acts iv. 24–30—of Stephen, Acts vii.—Paul's prayer for the Ephesians, Eph. iii. 14–21—for the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. v. 23—for the Hebrews, Heb. xiii. 20–21—Aaronic benediction, Num. vi. 20–26—Apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

ARCHIPPUS.

AT the request of *Archippus* we publish his fourth number. We thought, and still think, that his argument, so far as argument it is, is fairly presented in the pieces we have reviewed. This containing nothing new, we offer no remarks upon it. I trust our reply to *Andrew Broaddus* will suffice on this subject. Our opponents fail to offer any thing new on the subject. If any thing *new* appears we shall attend to it; but we must have done with repetitions. As his fifth number treats not upon this subject, we see no propriety in connecting it with the question at all. A word to those who write on the subject:—Arrange your arguments numerically; and let them be not only numerically, but in truth and reality, distinct. And if a new one occurs we shall try its strength upon its own merits. But having so many topics to discuss, we cannot fill our pages with new fashions of old arguments.

ED. M. H.

From the Christian Messenger.

NO. IV.

The Baptism of John, and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and of Water, as a Christian Ordinance.

THE baptism of John was preparatory to the appearance, and the reception of Jesus Christ. John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should should come after him—that is, on Christ Jesus. Acts xix. 4. Christ himself was to be exalted with the right hand of God, a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance and forgiveness of sins. All that John demanded from such as repaired to him to be baptized, was to declare their readiness to reform, and to frame their lives in a manner agreeably to that expectation. Luke iii. 7—14. He did not require a belief in any existing individual, as Messiah, in the previous part of his ministry; for he himself did not know him. John i. 31, 33. John came baptizing with water that Jesus Christ should be made manifest to Israel, (John i 31—34.) which was done when he was baptized of John in Jordan. Matt. iii. 5, 6, and v. 13—17. What occurred at Christ's baptism confirmed the mission of John, as Christ's forerunner, and the mission of Christ also, as the Son of God.

John told the people that he baptized in water unto repentance· but that he who should come after him was mightier than he, and would baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Matt. iii. 2. John did not baptize in the name of Christ, nor by his authority. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, or the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the miraculous gifts, ministered by Christ after he was glorified, were promised to, and were bestowed upon *none but believers*, and upon those who had been made to believe previously to their receiving the Holy Spirit by *external revelation*, consisting in what they *saw* and *heard*, exhibited in *miraculous works*, and *revealed words*. In proof of this read carefully the following passages: John vii. 38, 39. xiv. 12—18, 25, 26. xv. 26, 27. xvi. 7—15. xx. 30, 31. Read also Mark xvi. 17, 18, and Luke xxiv. 45—49. Christ, after he rose from the dead, and before he ascended into heaven, directed his disciples not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, "which," *saith he*, "you have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts i. 4, 5. The meaning of these promises, and of the prophecies relative to the outpouring of the Spirit, we have fully explained in their fulfilment, for which see Acts ii. throughout; also, viii. 12, 14—17. and xi. 14—47. and xi. 15—17. When the Spirit fell on the Gentiles, as stated in the last reference, and they began to speak with tongues and glorify God, "then," said Peter, "remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts xi. 18. All the revelations made to the Apostles, and the gifts bestowed upon them and on other disciples, and the signs and wonders wrought by them, were in consequence of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and were the fulfilment of ancient prophecies. This baptism of the Holy Ghost, and these miraculous gifts and outpouring of the Spirit, were the promise of the Father, which Jesus Christ received after he was exalted by his right hand, and which he shed forth in a *visible* and *audible* manner, to manifest and establish fully the truth of the new covenant, his own mediatorial character, reign, and glory, as the Son of God and heir of all things, and Saviour of the world; and *to perfect and confirm the whole gospel system*, which embraced in its divinely rich and boundless provision, Jew and Gentile in its fellowship. These miraculous operations and revelations proved that the old covenant was abolished by the death of Christ, and the new covenant established, and that the middle wall of partition, that was between the Jew and the Gentile, was broken down, and that God had put no difference between them, Christ having abolished by his death in the flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to make in himself of the two one new man, or church, thus making peace between them. Eph. ii.

The Apostle calls the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost the christian's seal and earnest of a heavenly inheritance. Eph. 1. 13—14. ch. iv. 30. 2 Cor. i. 22. They were moreover a seal and confirmation of the divine appointment, merits and reception of the atonement made by Christ, and of the power and success of his intercession with the Father; of his having received all power in heaven and in earth, in consequence of his death, and of his divine claim upon us to honor him even as we honor the Father, and that in worshipping the Father or the Son, we must worship the Father *in the Son*, and the Son *in the Father*. John v. 20. x. 38. xiv. 10, 11. xvii. 21. After the Jews and Gentiles were both sealed by the same Spirit, as being *one* under the new covenant, the disciples were called Christians.

As the visible or sensible descent of the Holy Spirit, and the powers which were conveyed by it to the first christians, was the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and made the proper seal of the christian doctrines, so the power of imparting these extraordinary gifts, in certain due proportions to other christians—that is, to those that believed, was the seal of the apostolic office and authority, as having been of divine appointment, and conferred by Jesus Christ. This power, which sealed and confirmed their mission, and their *infallibility in speaking and writing* the whole counsel of God in reference to the new covenant, and laws, ceased with the Apostles; and they of consequence have no apostolic succession. The infallible and perfect record, which they wrote by the direction of the Holy Ghost, and in the *words and sentences* which the Holy Ghost taught them, are in their place, and possess the divine verity and authority which the Apostles themselves possessed.

The opinions and notions that exist of the outpourings of the Spirit in our day, in revivals of religion, are unscriptural. If they were true, they would *unsettle* the whole gospel record. We have as much right to expect another Messiah, as we have a repetition of the outpourings and baptism of the Holy Spirit, which existed at the commencement of the gospel dispensation and through the apostolic age. The Spirit is never absent. His diversity of gifts and miraculous operations have varied. In him the sinner lives, and moves, and has his being; but his immediate natural presence and physical operations never gave religion. His *religion-giving operations* ever have been, and are his *external* revelations made in intelligible words. These are now wholly of record. He gives to the mind susceptibility for spiritual improvement, or sustains it by his immediate power; but the Christian religion, which consists in a system of truth, affection, and conduct, of which God is the great subject or supreme object, he communicates by his word. The Spirit himself is an *object of faith*, and his word is the instrument of it, and he is only known to exist by his word. By that word he glorifies Jesus Christ, and does not speak of himself, and converts and sanctifies sinners.

Since the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased, the Holy Ghost has sealed every true believer "to the day of redemption," through faith in Jesus Christ, by the infallible record, that God has given of his Son, and the divine influence imparted to the soul through it. This is known by the integrity of his faith, and the fruits of the Spirit, exhibited in his conduct and temper, corresponding with the gospel. According to this record, the seal of the Holy Ghost confirms the truth, that God justifies the Gentiles, or remits their sins, before they are baptized, through faith alone in Jesus Christ, as I proved in my second number, so that nothing shall be thought to intervene between the heart of the believer and Jesus Christ, in the justification of the ungodly, and in their obtaining the divine favor. Acts x. 44—48. xi. 15, 14—18. xv. 7, 9. Rom. i. 16, 17. iii. 29, 30. iv. 3—5. The faith that justifies and obtains *primarily* the divine favor, comprehends the *seminal principle* of every virtue, and will, if suitably improved by active obedience, and due exercise, be fruitful according to the gospel. The faith of a true believer receives Jesus Christ into his heart, in the fulness of his character and offices, for his salvation. He is by the grace of God made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, and he receives him as such. This he does before he is baptized. This he does

before he is baptized. What more can a sinner receive for his justification, or what more can God give?

I now come to consider water baptism as an ordinance of the gospel.

From the various passages of scripture in which baptism is mentioned, and from all the allusions made to it as an ordinance of the gospel, it seems to me to have a uniform reference to the new covenant, either in respect to the death, resurrection, and glory of Jesus Christ, in his mediatorial reign and kingdom, or to the effects of his death and reign upon the state and destiny of man.

Jesus Christ was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification. The gospel promise in general is, that whosoever believeth in Jesus Christ shall receive remission of sin. The Jews on the day of Pentecost were commanded to repent and be baptized in the name of him (Christ) for the remission of sin. Baptism to a believer, in its *primary* meaning, symbolically applies the promise of remission through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and represents its accomplishment in the present and future state, as the bread and wine in the supper represent to the believing communicant, the broken body and shed blood of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin: but I do not believe that baptism any more imparts *actual* remission, than that the bread and wine, broken and poured out, contribute the *real* body and blood of Christ, broken and shed for sin.

Baptism is not, in its primary meaning, a sign of the sanctifying operations of the Spirit, or an external sign of internal grace, as are alleged by some Paidobaptists, but it is a sign of *justification*, or of *the remission of sin*, as the Presbyterian Confession of Faith has stated it, chap. xxviii, "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of *remission of sins*, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life. It would be a gross error in theology to confound justification, or the remission of sin, with sanctification; or to give to the latter precedence to the former. A sinner, or an ungodly man, cannot be made *holy in his sins;* he must therefore be first justified, or his sins be remitted, before he can be received into the divine favor, or be made spiritually holy. This is done through faith in Jesus Christ; and he must have this faith before he is baptized, or the ordinance will be misapplied and lose its *meaning*. Sprinkling of water is not an emblem of the Spirit, but of the doctrine of the gospel, or of the influence of God's word. Deut. xxxii. 1—3. Psal. lxxii. 6. John lv. 10, 11. Baptism represents to the believer his union and communion with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection, and immortal glory. The expressions "buried into his death," "buried with him in baptism, wherein also you are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead," imply this communion. It also represents his resurrection to a new life of holiness, and ought to be a powerful incentive to it, in conformity to Christ's resurrection from the dead. Rom. vi. 4. vii: 4. Colos, ii. 11—13. iii. 1—5. Baptism represents the death of our natural body, and our resurrection from the dead, to inherit eternal life, which will be our conformity to Christ, who was put to death in the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit. Under the new covenant, although the bodies of believers are under the sentence of death, denounced upon the transgression of Adam, because the redemption of Christ was not intended to prevent the execution of this original sentence upon their bodies, it converts it into a benefit by the resurrection, by which the natural body is made a spiritual body—saints are thereby entirely freed from their remaining connexion with, and conformity to the first man, in order to their being conformed to the second. 1 Cor. xv. 47, 48, 49. That baptism represents the resurrection of the saints from the dead, to inherit eternal life with Christ, and that his death and resurrection are a proof and pledge of it, is plain from 1 Cor. xv. 29. "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead," for their belief in the resurrection of the dead, "if the dead rise not at all?" To deny the resurrection of the dead, it would

appear from this passage, sets aside the crowning design and meaning of baptism, and renders it of no consequence. And to deny that baptism is a representation and pledge of this, takes from it an essential part of its meaning. The resurrection of the righteous will be a regeneration in the most proper and perfect sense, and is that to which our regeneration, by the gospel of God's grace, and our baptism ultimately refer; "He saved us (or gave us a pledge of salvation) by the law of regeneration, and the renewal of the Holy Ghost, which he shed upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, to the end we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Titus iii. 3, 4, 7. Believers are now the sons of God, (Gal. iii. 27. 1 John iii. 1,) being born by the incorruptible seed of the word. 1 Peter i. 2—5. They are therefore waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body from the grave, when they shall be regenerated from death, in conformity to Christ the first begotten of the dead, and be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection, Rom. viii. 23. Rev. i. 5. Acts xxvi. 23. Luke xx. 36. And if I mistake not, the declaration of Christ to Nicodemus had particular reference to the resurrection of the dead in John iii. 7. and perhaps primarily to his own, because none of his immediate disciples, who were baptized before his death, entered into the kingdom by baptism, nor did the Gentiles. The kingdom was not set up when the former were baptized, the blood of the new covenant had not been shed, and the King had not been crowned; and the Gentiles were in the kingdom, and the kingdom in them, before they were baptized; for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, Rom. xiv. 17. which they realized before they were baptized, Acts x. 44—47. Acts xi. 15—18.

By the resurrection from the dead, which is alone incident to the new covenant, and is represented by immersion, as is also the remission of sin, believers will be in the most ample and perfect sense, "*born of the Spirit*," and "born from above," and will *be spirit*. Without this, their bodies cannot inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. xv. 50. The body is sown a natural body, it will be raised a spiritual body; for as we have borne the image of the earthly Adam, we shall bear the image of the heavenly. Hence through that faith, by which the mercy of God hath begotten us to the hope of another life, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself. 1 Peter i. 5—5, Phil. iii. 20, 21. "We shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every one that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John iii. 2, 3.

Having thus exhibited what seems to me to be the general meaning and design of baptism, I desire to state what I apprehend ought to be the particular views, and purpose of an individual believer, in submitting to the ordinance.

There is one baptism, as there is one body or church, and one Spirit, as we are called in one hope of one calling; one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in all. The one baptism is designed to unite all believers in one spirit and body, or fellowship in Jesus Christ, as the foundation and head of the church. The observance of every ordinance and duty in religion promotes experimental religion; that is, it increases the proof of the truth of religion in the heart of the christian, by actual trial. John vii. 17. xiv. 21, 23. Baptism, by divine appointment, when scripturally apprehended is necessary to this end. The religious *state of mind* of the believer, produced by baptism, cannot be obtained in any other way than by it. Without baptism being voluntarily submitted to, the heart does not feel itself bound to Jesus Christ by the obligation of personal baptismal profession and consecration, nor can it feel confidence in his protection and favor. Without baptism the believer has not had the symbolical application of God's promise of remission of sin made to his conscience, nor has he received the baptismal representation of the remission of sin into his soul, by being immersed into Jesus Christ. Without baptism he has not the answer of a good conscience towards God, by

which he is saved, or has the pledge of salvation by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him. 1 Peter iii. 21, 22.—Without baptism, unless the conscience be perverted, the believer cannot be satisfied; he must be involved in uncertainty, fear, and perplexity. He feels that he has not surrendered himself to Jesus Christ, and cannot claim his smiles according to his promises; as he cannot claim his protection in a course of disobedience.

By the act of baptism, submitted to *understandingly*, the heart of the believer is fixed in Christ, and he commences the public life of a christian. In this solemn ordinance and act of worship the believer gives himself up to Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to be instructed, governed, and saved by him. From this solemn transaction he goes forth with his heart confirmed, and with a fixed purpose of leaving the life he lives in the flesh, and by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him, and to cultivate the fruit of the Spirit in love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and temperance. Gal. ii. 20. iii. 22, 26.

Although baptism is submitted to but once, it operates upon all succeeding life, if *scripturally* understood and improved. All the blessings of the new covenant are associated with it, and it connects itself by the word of God, with every future change and event, up to the last judgment and finnal glory. In his probationary state it keeps the christian firm and fast in his profession of faith in Jesus Christ, as it perpetually reminds him that he has been translated by the grace of God into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom he has redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin. Col. i. 19—14.

Christian baptism is an individual and personal duty, and is not a subject of fellowship, which implies plurality. If there be any fellowship in the ordinance, it is between the soul of the subject of it and Christ himself. It is not a church ordinance, nor is it administered by the church, or in the church, or to the church, if administered according to the gospel. The christian should ever remember that it was the ordinance of Jesus Christ with which he was baptized, and not a Baptist or Paidobaptist ordinance, and that he was baptized into the one spirit and body of Christ, and not into the spirit and body of a sect or party. He should therefore feel it to be as much his duty to exclude from his views, affections, and conduct, after being baptized, every thing of a sectarian nature, as he did, if he acted truly and scripturally, from Jesus Christ, his gospel and ordinance, when he received and submitted to them.

There is nothing in which we are more liable to err than we are in our views of baptism; and error here tends to give a wrong direction to the whole course of our religious and moral feelings and sympathies, as far as it is concerned. We err if we confer upon baptism the importance of an ultimate object, or the efficacy of the blood of Christ, when submitted to, either with or without faith. Indeed, the faith that does this is itself erroneous. We err, if in being baptized, we are baptized into a party spirit or system, or if we are not baptized into the spirit of Christ, and we err if we make our own views and opinions of baptism, whether they be right or wrong, the test of christian character, or fellowship at the Lord's table. Sincere christian men, men who love and desire to honor the Lord Jesus Christ, may err through ignorance, and in scriptural views on the subject of baptism; but God does not suspend his fellowship with them, or their salvation upon the correctness or infallibility of their opinions or judgment on the subject of baptism. There is not a Baptist upon earth that might not tremble were his salvation suspended upon this principle.

There are five different opinions, if not more, of the time when sinners are justified, or when their sins are remitted, viz.—

1. Some believe that the sins of the elect were remitted in eternity. This is what is called eternal justification.

2. Others believe that sins were remitted at the death of Christ,

3. Others believe that sins are remitted when a person believes in Jesus Christ.

4. Others believe that sins are remitted only in the act of immersion, and that all are in their sins, notwithstanding their repentance and faith, until they are actually baptized for the remission of their sins.

5. Others believe that the faithful will not be in truth justified until the final judgment, when the sentenee of acquittal will be pronounced upon them with a view to their whole probationary state.

Good men thus divide in opinion, and employ scripture authority to support them. But of all the five opinions stated, the fourth one is the most exclusive, sectarian, and uncharitable; and if fostered, cannot fail to drive from the affection and fellowship of those who entertain it, all who differ from them, as being in their sins, however otherwise pious and godly! And the exclusive authority by which this strange opinion is formed, is found in the expressions used to the Pentecostal Jews, in the 2d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and to Saul of Tarsus, in the 22d chapter of the Acts, and which were never used to the Gentiles. The former were commanded to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin, and the latter to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins; but in no instance were the like expressions used to the Gentiles in the Acts of the Apostles, while direct and unequivocal proof was given by God himself that he had remitted the sins of the Gentiles before they were baptized, Acts x. xi. xv. Surely *all New Testament christians* will consider these things, and accommodate their views, affections, and fellowship to "*the ancient order of things*" as exhibited in the gospel, and not so far *judaize* as to *transmute* the Gentile into the Jewish state, in the beginning of the gospel, so as to *unchristian* all Gentile believers who may differ from them in their *mistaken* views of baptism, in the present day. Christians have use for all the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel, that they may stand fast in the faith, and possess and manifest the temper and spirit of their common Lord, as they are interested in his common salvation. The profession of their faith and baptism separate them from the world, and associates them in visible union and fellowship with all the people of God, in Christ Jesus, and lay them under obligation to love all, with brotherly affection, who love him. The supper, properly attended to in the fellowship of the saints, renews the visible and sensible memorial of Christ's love, and the love of his people to him and to one another, and employs them in the actual manifestation of them, while it publishes his death, or shows it forth until he come. These things with the regular observance of all other christian duties, establish a *habit* of spiritual mindedness, and christian philanthropy, which secures us against selfishness, against a sectarian spirit and party pride, and against the assaults of sin, and enable us to stem the force of a torrent of corruption that never ceases to flow. This habit opposes the enjoyment of religion and the hope of heaven to the spirit and customs of the world—it opposes a sense of the divine favor to the pleasure of sinful indulgencies, and enables us to *prove* by actual trial, or experiment, what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.

ARCHIPPUS.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

King & Queen, August 9, 1831.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

IN your 5th number of the current volume of the Harbinger, the reader is favored with a few remarks upon the word *matheteuo*, by your very able correspondent Philalethes. His writings are fairly calculated to produce important results; and it cannot be deemed flattery to say, that he justly stands at, or very near the head of the rank of your contributors. His acute discernment, and habitual

depth of thought, cast about his productions much influence. He seems deeply imbued with a holy love of the simple oracles of truth and life, and if he is, what he appears to be, would not by any thing *human* mislead any inquirer after truth. It is in this light that I now venture to call back his attention, and invite yours, to his remarks upon the subject of *discipling to Christ*.

When I read the remarks alluded to, and your notice of them, it occurred to me that there was something objectionable in the first, and some ambiguity in the last; something like a mere "go-by," which was not like yourself. I have but a word to say upon this part of the subject, and though it be by reversing the order of things, it shall be said first. I had entertained the impression that the views inculcated by you differ materially from those urged by Philalethes, and felt deep surprise at your notice of them. Unless I have grossly misunderstood one or both of you, this conviction must be founded upon fact. I will only add the request, that you will do me the favor of a few remarks more upon this matter. Others of your readers will likewise be gratified by such a course.

Philalethes is an utter stranger to me, and for aught I know might require an apology for my course; he shall have it: and from his character, as drawn from his writings, I feel confident that he will deem it sufficient. It is this: I have been engaged for a few years in trying to lead my fellow-creatures to subjection to the Saviour of sinners, and during the last year or more, have particularly inculcated, that without faith, repentance, reformation, and *immersion*, they could not become the *disciples of Christ*, or *christians*. My most earnest desire is to learn the truth, in reference to all points of religion; but more particularly as to the greater points, if I may be allowed the distinction. What, then, I ask, is the truth here? I ask sincerely—I ask of you who are competent to aid the ignorant. And that the truth may be more deeply rooted in my heart when it comes, all my errors upon this point should be rooted out; but this cannot be done, unless I expose them. I must submit them to their fate. I would not be the slave of error, nor the victim of prejudice if I could avoid it. If my views be incorrect, I am at this time suffering under the operation of both these causes.

The conclusion to which I would particularly invite attention is this: "There may be," says Philalethes, "a real scholarship without a concomitant avowal of it; nay, that a secret and *real* scholarship must precede a public profession of it, otherwise the public profession of it must be an act of downright hypocrisy. And here a question of importance occurs. Is a *real* but *unavowed* discipleship of no other benefit to its owner, than to put him in a condition to make a public profession without hypocrisy? Certain it is, that before immersion, or any other avowal of his christian attainments, a person may have read, understood, and believed every declaration which God has made, may have apprehended clearly and strongly the tendency of these declarations to affect not only his temporal, but his eternal happiness also, and may have had his mind thus greatly enlightened and

powerfully impressed; his affections much excited and drawn to God; and his *actions* duly rectified by them: in short, may have all the *elements* of a christian—knowledge, faith, love, and obedience produced in him: and must we consider all this as null and void till there be a public annunciation of its inward and invisible existence?" He says, "Truly I cannot believe it." But can Philalethes not believe things equally hard of another sort? Can he not believe that an Englishman may read, understand, and believe the declaration of American independence, and the excellent constitution based thereon, apprehend "clearly and strongly the tendency" of this declaration and constitution to promote the best rights and interests of all good subjects of the government—nay, have his mind greatly "enlightened and powerfully impressed, his affections much excited and drawn" towards this country; in short, have all the essentials or "elements" of which an Englishman should or could be possessed in order to become an American citizen, and yet live and die on the British island? Surely he can believe this without difficulty. Nor will he contend that such an individual is a *real* American. But he may object that I have not run a fair parallel, having left out both "rectified actions" and "obedience." Now how a man can be possessed of "actions duly rectified by them," [the truth's of God's word,] and "obedience produced in him," without either having *confessed* or *put on Christ*, is to me a serious difficulty. The reformation of a sinner, without *obedience* to God, must surely be some other than that contemplated by the New Testament. But again: the *elements* of which a christian may be made do not always necessarily constitute a christian; in fact, the word itself conveys an idea of something unfinished. So we would say of all arts and sciences—of men and things. Whenever we speak of the elements of any thing, we convey the idea of imperfection, confusion, &c. a taking to pieces that which is (analysis) or putting together so as to constitute that which is not, as by synthesis. Permit me to suppose another difficulty: An individual hears for the first time that the forgiveness of sins is proclaimed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;—his attention is arrested —he inquires into the particulars of the plan—is informed that in Adam all became subject to the dominion and consequences of sin;—he believes it—that in Christ is fulness of redemption, which is clearly and scripturally set forth;—he is held up not only as a sacrifice for sin, but as a Prophet, Priest, and King;—he believes all these things—he is taught that repentance towards God must be exercised—reformation of manners immediately exhibited—all of which he believes and determines within himself to regard accordingly;—and lastly, that he must be found willing to confess the Lord with his mouth and be immersed for the remission of his sins;—to which he as heartily objects as he had cordially received the foregoing items. Now I would ask, would not such a man be fairly considered a *real* disciple as far as he goes? And, on the other hand, is he not as *real* an opposer to the cross of Christ as he well can be? And what would the matter be bettered should he say, Yea, Lord, even to all that was taught and enjoined, and yet go his way and not *do* accordingly.

It seems to me that the *nature* of the christian institution presents an insuperable difficulty before this view. It never seems to contemplate mere *mental* disciples as christians. And in this particular it differs widely from our ordinary loose application of the term disciple. Men are called disciples of Gill, Fuller, Wesley, &c. pretty much, I think, after the sense in which P. views the matter, and they can be only so; they are, in a word, complete. But there is no good reason for discipling men to Christ after the same fashion; and the foundation of the difference is this: Fuller and others have had *no authority to impose rules and regulations or terms of discipleship upon mankind*;—no institution within which great blessings and privileges were or are to be enjoyed, and without a regard to which, awful pains and penalties are made dependent and positively to be suffered;—while Christ has in *wisdom* appointed the best of plans, and that a conditional one, and in his *power* exacted a rigid submission to it by all to whom it is made known, if they would obtain its benefits. While, then, the disciples of Fuller may be only *mentally* so, and yet *really* so, without even uttering his name in an audible voice, or submitting to any advice he may have even given as to deportment, we feel unable at present to say as much for those who may wish to indulge unauthorized claims upon the christian institution. And this position it seems to me may not only be sustained by the *nature* of the christian institution as a whole, but by its particular application to practice, according to its own declarations. But as I designed to elicit truth in the shortest and easiest way, I will enter into nothing elaborate, and proceed to hold out to notice the views inculcated by myself, as before promised, that they may be corrected if erroneous. My objections to the common use of the word disciple are based upon the distinction above laid down, and will be presented with very simple illustrations.

I wish it to be borne in mind that I have not the most remote idea of entering into a mere criticism upon the original word; to such a task I am incompetent; but would look at this subject through the medium of our present translations, and make use of it accordingly.

I understand the gospel to be submitted to mankind as a rule of faith and life to intelligent and accountable beings. As an agent, man is allowed the right to judge of it; if he likes it, he embraces it. and *vice versa*. And discipleship turns altogether upon the fact of embracing it or not, and not upon the insulated *liking* or *approving* the plan only. I remarked a little while ago, that I would give suitable illustrations of my view. Suppose Professor C—— should announce through suitable verbal heralds, or through a printed communication, his determination to commence on a certain day, at a certain place, under particular and *peculiar* rules and terms, a valuable course of useful instruction to gentlemen and ladies of particular classes or descriptions. A, an individual into whose hands the proposal falls, finds it particularly interesting, and has no doubt that a due improvement of the opportunity thus afforded him will be valuable. He considers again and again the plan—thinks of himself, his circumstances—the teacher—the institution, laws, &c. and determines

to *become a disciple*. His friend B meets and salutes him as the disciple of Professor C——. But replies A, "My friend, you are mistaken; I am not the disciple of Professor C——." B. "Not the disciple of C——? Have you not determined upon entering his seminary?" "I have." "Have you not given him your name and your pledge in the form of admittance fee?" "I have, and am resolved to gain all that I can at his hands." "And not a disciple? How paradoxical! Please explain." "Cheerfully: Professor C—— has an institution which is not yet in operation; I am pleased with the plan, believe in his competency, and in the probable utility of his course I feel confident: but as yet I have not thrown myself upon his hands, nor placed myself under his control, which I can only do by repairing on, or after a certain day to a particular place, nor even then become a disciple until I receive his instruction and commence *learning in detail*. Though I believe from his general proposal, that he will teach every branch of polite and useful learning, and have thereby been informed of the outlines, all this does not constitute me a learner of the things proposed; nay, though I might hereafter obtain through others much of the instruction which he will then impart, I could not be recognized as *one of his disciples in any sense*, nor expect a *diploma* at his hands."

I must ask pardon for my intrusion, while I barely add one more hint. We all know that there is in the world what is called the *Masonic Institution*. Now upon the hypothesis of Philalethes, every member was a *real* Mason before he entered a lodge: but no Mason can agree to such a position. Take away the *formalities* or *externals* of the Christian Institution, and we will not hesitate to predict the speedy destruction of all the internal realities of the great structure: they must stand or fall together. The great importance of this subject, which cannot readily be expressed, has impelled me to wander much more widely than I at first designed. I may have misunderstood the writer of the remarks, Philalethes, but must still hope to hear from one or both of you again.

As a friend of a pure speech and inquirer after truth,
I remain yours, JOHN.

ATHEISM REFUTED.

THE Religious Tracts which are every where inundating society, some of them, no doubt, worth a reading, but many of them unworthy of a christian community, have stimulated the Atheists to similar adventures for proselyting. A specimen of these Tracts we lay before our readers, as a monument of the ignorance of those who oppose revelation—as a specimen of the ignorance and malignity of Atheism in the year 1831.

A young disciple, into whose hands we put it as a test of his biblical knowledge, furnished us with the following grave exposition of its recklessness of truth and impudence of assertion. The only objection we have to the expose is, that the text is unworthy of the sermon; but as it is the production of a strippling in the faith, we thought it

might be useful to a certain class of readers, and, perhaps, to some one of those little philosophers who stare with admiration at the man as a prodigy of wisdom and science, who, without a blush, can give utterance to his ignorance of the whole matter at which he snarls.

EDITOR.

SCRIPTURE HARMONY.

THOSE who hire themselves out to explain this holy book uniformly assert that the Bible is an unerring rule of faith and manners; and the Westminster Divines, in their Confession of Faith, have declared that "God, by his singular care and providence, has kept them pure in all ages of the world;" which purity consists in being dark as Erebus, confused as Chaos, and opposite as the poles. A modern apologist, who has said as much as he possibly can in favor of the inspiration, has resigned the singular care and providence to the mercy of its detractors; while the Bible critics of all ages give us abundant proofs of the alterations it must have undergone, both from pious fraud and holy ignorance. We shall at present drop these objections, as they are but gnats for believers to swallow, and proceed to observe a few of those divine contradictions which render this book so peculiarly edifying to the godly.

The 11th chapter of Genesis makes Abram one hundred and thirty-five years of age when he left the country of Haran; the 12th chapter says he was only seventy-five. The Lord threatens to visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation, Exod. xx. 5. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 18. Deut. v. 9. This he flatly denies, Deut. xxiv. 16. 2 Chron. xxv. 4, and the whole 13th chapter of Ezekiel, is taken up in demonstrating the injustice of it. In Exodus xxxiii. 11, the Lord speaks to Moses face to face, as a man speaks to his friend; in the 20th verse he could not see his face, for no man could see it and live.

Num. xxvii. 13. Deut. xxxii. 49. the Lord ordered Moses to go up on Mount Abarim, and die there; Deut. xxxiv. 1, says it was on the top of Pisgah. As Moses died at two different places, it must also have been at different times. Aaron also died at Mosera, Deut. x. 6, and at Mount Hor, seven stations from the former place, Num. xxxiii. 30, 38; two strong proofs of a resurrection, most unfortunately overlooked by commentators. If we believe Joshua x. 36, it was him, and all Israel with him, that took Hebron and Debir; but if we are to credit chapter xv. 14. Jud. i. 10, these places were not taken for a long time after that.

In 2d Sam. xxiv. 1, the *Lord* moved David to number Israel and Judah, and the numbers were—the men of Israel eight hundred thousand, and of Judah five hundred thousand, for which he had the choice of seven years' famine, three months' war, or three days' pestilence; and the price he paid for Auranah's threshing floor is stated at fifty shekels of silver. 1 Chron. xxi. 1, says it was *Satan* who provoked David; the numbers here are the men of Israel one million one hundred thousand; those of Judah four hundred and seventy thousand; the time of the famine is dwindled away to three years, but the price of the threshing floor is advanced to six hundred shekels of gold.

1 Kings iv. 26, says, Solomon had forty thousand stalls for horses; 2 Chron. ix. 25, allows no more than four thousand. 1 Kings v. 11, says Solomon gave to Hiram twenty thousand measures of wheat, and twenty measures of oil. 2 Chron. ii. 10, makes twenty thousand measures of wheat twenty thousand of barley, twenty thousand baths of wine, and twenty thousand of oil. In 1st Kings vii. 14, the artificer, whom the king of Tyre sent to Solomon, was the son of a woman of the tribe of Naphtali; 2d Chron. ii. 14, says she was of the tribe of Dan. 1st Kings vii. 15, makes the two pillars of the porch eighteen cubits; 2 Chron. iii. 15, makes them thirty-five. 1st Kings vii. 26, makes the brazen sea to contain two thousand baths; 2 Chron. iv. 5, says three thousand. 1st Kings xv. 2, says Abijah's mother was Maachah, the daughter of Abisha-

fom; the 10th verse of this chapter says she was the mother of Asa; 2d Chron. xi. 20, says Abijah's mother was Maachah, the daughter of Absalom; but chapter xiii. 2, says it was Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, that was Abijah's mother.

1st Kings xv. 16, 32, says, "There was war between Baasha and Asa all their days." Now as Baasha began to reign in the third year of Asa, this war must have been during the ten years the land had quiet, 2d Chron. xiv. 1. But how are we surprised to find, that after the period of this ten years' quiet, it was not with Baasha, but with Zerah, the Ethiopian, who had a host of one million three hundred chariots, whom he attacked with five hundred and eighty thousand men, that he had war, verse 9. How immensely superior in point of numbers are revealed armies to those which the greatest powers could ever actually bring into the field. "And there was no more war until the five and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa," chap. xv. 19, when Baasha must have been dead nine years, according to 1st Kings xvi. 8. Nor was it until the six and thirtieth year that Baasha began to build Ramah (ten years after he was dead,) which was surely no war, and we have no accounts of any other. When a revealed story is both contradictory and confused, it is a proof that inspiration has reached the acme.

2d Kings i. 17, says that Jehoram, the son of Ahab, began to reign in the second year of Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah; the third chapter says it was in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat; chapter viii. 16, is at variance with both these. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the chronologies of the kings of Judah and Israel, will find a sad mass of confusion to clear up, and a great disagreement in the end, which no one can set right. 2d Kings viii. 26, says Ahaziah was twenty-two years old when he began to reign; 2d Chron. xxii. 2, says forty-two; but his father Jehoram being only thirty-two years old when he began to reign, and having reigned only eight years, the son, at this rate, must be two years older than the father. Still further, all the sons of Jehoram were carried away by the Philistines and Arabians, 2d Chron. xxi. 17, save only Jehoahaz, the youngest. Chapter xxii. 1, says that "the inhabitants of Jerusalem made Ahaziah, his youngest son, king in his stead; for the band of men that came with the Arabians had slain all the eldest." It appears, however, from 2d Kings x. 12, that Jehu, king of Israel, put himself to the trouble of "slaying" them over again; regardless of their being carried away and slain before, and likewise their sons, although they had none. Ahaziah himself was also twice killed, once in Samaria, where he was slain and buried, 2 Chron. xxii. 8, 9; also at Megiddo, and buried at Jerusalem, 2 Kings ix. 27. Commentators have an easy way of reconciling matters. Jehoahaz and Ahaziah are the same person, and as for people being killed twice or thrice over in different places, it is quite common in revealed story—a mere *bagatelle*, which none but infidels would carp at.

2 Chron. xxi. 12, Elijah sent a writing to Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, King of Judah; but according to 2 Kings ii. and iii. Elijah was taken up into heaven more than seven years before that; at least before the eighteenth of Jehoshaphat. When inspired writers tell us stories of this nature, we cannot hesitate a moment in giving them all due credit. To crown all the other contradictions, the Lord denies having any hand in the Mosaic institution of sacrifices, Jer. vii. 22. "For I spake not to your fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." Moses says the very reverse. The very laws which Moses had from the mouth of the Lord are contradictory one of another; Lev. xviii. 16, and xx. 21. forbids the cohabiting with, or marrying a brother's wife; Deut. xxv. 5, commands it. Lev. xix. 34 enjoins equal justice to strangers as natives. Chap. xxv. 45, allows the enslaving of strangers and their children. But we should never have done if we were to notice every contradiction that occurs in holy writ; we shall only observe, that it is writing in this manner that constitutes the divine harmony of scripture, so much insisted on by the priesthood.

[*Liberal Tracts, No.* 2.]

To answer all these alleged contradictions, would be a tedious and useless effort. We shall take some 8 or 10 of the first as a sample, and show with what ease such imputations can be repelled. Ten thousand such objections might be proposed by any sceptic who knows as little as the author of this tract, and the only point which they prove is the consummate ignorance of sacred literature of their fabricator.

Contradiction 1*st*. "The 11th chap. of Gen. makes Abram 135 years of age when he left the country of Haran; the 12th chap. says he was only 75."

The 11th chap. says nothing about the going out of Abram, at all, and our author's inference is most illogical indeed. His premises are, verse 26, "And Terah lived 70 years, and begat Abram;" consequently Terah was not 71 years older than Abram. But Terah's death (which was not till he was 205 years old) is mentioned before the going out of Abram from Haran; therefore our author makes the sacred historian say that Terah died before Abram went out of Haran. The scriptures do not say so; the sacred historian has merely followed out one thread of his narrative to the end, and has then gone back and resumed another—but no contradiction. If it be, there is not a historian, ancient or modern, that does not contradict himself every fifty pages. For example: Plutarch, in his Lives of the celebrated men of Greece and Rome, begins page 312* with the life of Sylla, a cotemporary of Julius Cesar; relates adventures and conversations in which they were engaged together, and closes page 335 with the death and funeral of Sylla—again, page 495, he begins the life of Cesar; but is this saying that Cesar was not born until a long time after Sylla was dead? He also speaks of Sylla as alive, and performing mighty deeds; but must we suppose the resuscitation of Sylla, to save Plutarch from the imputation of lying? Surely not. But this is so plain the most slow to learn must apprehend it.

Contradiction 2d. "The Lord threatens to visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation, Ex. xx. 5; this he flatly denies, Deut. xxiv. 16."

Had this author but finished his quotation of Ex. xx. 5, he would have saved himself and me some trouble; for lo! it reads thus: "For I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of *them that hate me;*" and mark what follows—"but showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Here the Lord does not visit the iniquities of the fathers upon those children that love him and keep his commandments, but upon the children that hate him; nor yet upon these, only as the sins of the *fathers* become those of the *children* by doing or approving the same. Hence our Lord said to the Jews, "The blood of all the righteous persons *slain*, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, the son of Barachiah, who perished between the ALTAR and the sanctua-

* I quote Plutarch as bound in one volume. They are frequently bound in eight volumes.

ry, shall be required of this generation:" and why? not because they were the children of those who slew them, but because, says he, "you are witnesses for yourselves that you allow the deeds of your fathers."

Contradiction 3d. "In Ex. xxxiii. 11, the Lord speaks to Moses, face to face, as a man speaks to a friend; in the 20th verse, he could not *see* his face, for no man could see his face and live."

And so it seems that two beings cannot converse face to face unless they look each other in the face. Two men could not converse face to face in the dark, nor could two blind men converse, face to face, at all! Is it so? And what is the idea of conversing "face to face"? Is it not to enter into *familiar oral conversation?* Let us hear the connection of this matter—verse 9, we begin: "And it came to pass as Moses entered into the tabernacle the cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses; and all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the door of the tabernacle, and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent door: and the Lord spake to Moses, face to face, as a man speaketh unto a friend." There was, then, a cloudy pillar *between* the Lord and Moses while they conversed face to face.

Contradiction 4th. "Numbers xxvii. 13, Deut. xxxii. 49, the Lord ordered Moses to go up on Mount Abarim, and die there; Deut. xxxiv. 1, says it was on the top of Pisgah. As Moses died at two different places, it must also have been at different times."

So says this "liberal" author. What a pity it is he had not searched the scriptures for something besides contradictions; he would then have read them in their connection, not in insulated scraps: but sectarian teachers have taught this method of reading the scriptures. Numbers xxxiii. 48, 49, explains the matter: "And they [the children of Israel] removed from Almondiblathaim and pitched in the *mountains* of Abarim, before *Nebo*; and they departed from the mountains of Abarim and pitched in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho." Thus we find that Abarim was the general name of a cluster of mountains, Nebo the name of a single mountain, and Pisgah its peak, summit, or height.

Contradiction 5th. "Aaron also died at Mosera, Deut. x. 6, and at mount Hor, seven stations from the former place, Num. xxxiii. 30–38; two strong proofs of a resurrection most unfortunately overlooked by commentators."

Mosera was a village, as we learn by recurring to the ancient maps; and whoever knows any thing of ancient geography knows that countries were not divided into states, counties, and townships, as in these United States; but cities, towns, and villages of any note, gave name to a large district of country around them. Hence, the last battle between Alexander, the Macedonian, and Darius, the Persian, is called the battle of Arbela, although the battle was fought more than twelve miles from that village. Besides, the books of Exodus and Numbers are minute details, but the book of Deuteronomy is a recapitulation of the law; and a general summary of the whole history of

the Israelites, giving all the prominent events. And how often is it practised by historians, after giving the *minutiæ*, to give a *summary?* How often do we, in conversation, after having been once explicit upon a matter, afterwards speak of it less definitively? For example: If I should on my return to the lake, speak of a friend who had died at Bethany during my stay there, I might afterwards, in speaking of the event to the same persons, say, my friend died in Virginia; and where would be the contradiction? Let the reader judge.

Contradiction 6th. "If we believe Joshua x. 36, it was him, [he*] and all Israel with him, that took Hebron and Debir; but if we are to credit chap. xv. 14, Jud. i. 10, these places were not taken for a long time after that."

Xenophon, as quoted by M. Rollin, has given us a contradiction of the same kind. Vol. 2, p. 112, he has given us an account of the taking of Babylon, by Cyrus the Great; but, (to use the language just quoted) if we are to credit" page 303, it was not taken "for a long time after that," and then not by Cyrus, but by one of his successors, Darius, the son of Hystaspes. I shall leave the author of the tract to examine these connections, and explicate for himself.

Contradiction 7th. "2 Sam. xxiv. 1, the Lord moved David to number the children of Israel—1 Chron. xxi. 1, says it was Satan that provoked David."

It is also related by historians that Xerxes threw fetters into the sea, to confine it while he should chastise it with whips; and it is said that Solomon built the temple at Jerusalem—but this they did by *agents*. The Governor of the Universe performs things by agents, too; and Satan was as willing an agent of the Lord as the angel Gabriel, when the message was to *punish* or *vex* that favored people, the Hebrews.

Again: He refers to the immense armies mentioned in scripture, and says—"How immensely superior in point of numbers are revealed armies to those which the greatest powers could ever actually bring into the field!" It is said by Xenophon that Semiramis, the foundress of Babylon, headed three millions of men against one of the kings of India; and it is said, by some, that Xerxes headed the *same number* against the Greeks. Does our author find any revealed armies greater than these? He may say, some authors rate the last mentioned army at one million: True, they do; but the single city of Thebes once produced a hundred thousand fighting men, and Babylon three times that number. And the single city of Rome once contained six millions of inhabitants; but what of that? Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, led a million of warriors against an Indian king, and when all were ready to perish with famine, he ordered the soldiers to cast lots, and every tenth man be slain, to serve as food for his companions; and thus almost the whole army perished. Had this been related by the Jewish historians, it doubtless would have been considered as one of their "*long bow*" stories, for which our author

* I would advise this gentleman to learn to read grammar before he turns critic.

seems to think them so remarkable; but, as it is recorded by a Pagan, he can well believe it.

But in the conclusion, our author says—"To crown all the other contradictions, the Lord denies having any hand in the Mosaic institution of sacrifices, Jer. vii. 22; 'For I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices.'"

Had our author met here with what he conceived to be a contradiction, and proposed it in the form of a difficulty, we might well have borne with him, although even then he would have been culpable for his ignorance; but what shall we say when he so confidently and presumptuously affirms? We trust we shall not be to blame if we simply repeat what a certain wise man once said—"He that judgeth a matter before he heareth [or understandeth] it, is a fool." 'Tis true the Lord did not speak to the children of Israel concerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices "in the day he brought them out of the land of Egypt;" but is this saying they were not of divine appointment? Nay, verily; they had been instituted long before, even contemporaneous with the sin of our first parents. This principle existed throughout the whole of the divine economy toward fallen man, that, "without the shedding of blood there was no remission." The burnt offerings and sacrifices were not *added to the law of Moses*, but the law of Moses was added to them.

And now, in the conclusion, let me address a few words to the author of this tract. What is there, my friend, in the *pure morality* of the scriptures, which should so call forth your spleen? what in the blissful hope of immortality that should elicit your hate? Be assured, my friend, "there will be a resurrection, both of the *just* and of the *unjust*;" and unless you repent, and believe the gospel, you will in that day "awake to shame and everlasting contempt." You have yet to confess (with all the *infidel fraternity*) that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, much as you may now hate him; "for he shall be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Then will Celsus and Voltaire, with all the host of unbelievers, "call upon the rocks and mountains to fall upon them and hide them from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb." Then, in the anguish of your souls, will you shriek—"Jesus is the Messiah! yes, Jesus is the Son of God!" for so hath Jehovah sworn, saying, "As I live, every knee shall bow to him, and every tongue shall confess." "He hath given him a name, above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and upon the earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." "Behold he cometh in clouds, and every eye shall see him; they also that pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth, shall wail because of him; even so, amen."

MATTHEW LEVI.

THE NEW VERSION SUSTAINED BY THE BISHOP'S BIBLE.

I HAVE seen copies of the version read by our ancestors some two hundred and thirty years ago, but have not an English Bible of those dates. The following extracts, forwarded by brother Reid, will be acceptable to many of our readers, and will demonstrate how unfounded are the imputations of our opponents, who represent the new version as made to favor a system. This old Bible is more favorable, in some respects, to our views, than the new version. The annotations, also, are more in accordance with the text than most of the recent commentaries. The quotations forwarded to us are, we presume, a fair sample of the whole. Reader, did not our ancestors read a plainer version than that now commonly read by authority?

Editor.

WASHINGTON, 5th Oct. 1831.

Respected Brother:

AS I returned from court to day, I stopped at Mayslick, and found in possession of our brothers Asa and James Runyon, a Bible printed 216 years ago, by the King's Printer; and having a desire to look into a volume so old, I spent some hours in reading and taking the following copy from it, intending when chance should throw me among those who revile the new translation so much, to show them the similarity between it and the so much boasted one of King James, and that the error lies not so much in the original one of King James as in the copies since printed, or attempts at copies. From the few passages I have examined, the idea of forgiveness of sins in baptism was not *new* at that period, judging from the notes especially. And it seems to me that if those who abuse the new translation for the word "Reform," could only read this ancient Bible, and pay proper attention to Peter's words, "Amend your lives, and be baptized, every one of you, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." If, I say, they could read it and be convinced, as I am, that it was printed before your great great grand father was born, they would cease to charge you with altering the word of God to suit your own purposes. They would not say you had put the word *reform* where *repent* ought to be, upon seeing a volume so old using the word *amend*.

Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Maiesty. CUMPRIUILEGIO REGIE MAIESTATIS, *Anno* 1615.

"*The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to John.*

"In the beginning was that word, and that word was with God, and that word was God. This same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by it, and without it was made nothing that was made. In it was life, and that life was the light of men. And that light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not."—[End of 5th verse, 1st chap.]

"*The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew.*

Chap. iii. beginning verse 6—"And they were baptized of him in

Jordan, confessing their sins. Now when he saw many of the Pharisees, and of the Sadducees, come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers! who hath forewarned you to flee from the anger to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruit worthy of amendment of life. And think not to say with yourselves, We have Abraham to *our* father; for I say unto you that God is able even of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also is the axe put to the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Indeed, I baptize you with water to amendment of life; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

"*The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Mark.*

"The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Sonne of God: As it is written in the Prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee—the voice of him that cryeth in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight! John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of amendment of life for remission of sins."

"*The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Luke.*

Chap. iii. verse 3. "And he came into all the coasts about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

"*The Acts of the Holy Apostles, written by Luke, the Evangelist.*

Chap. ii. verse 36. "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know, for a surety, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ; this Jesus, I say, whom ye have crucified. Now when they heard it, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the other Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Amend your lives, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Chap. iii. beginning at verse 14—"But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murtherer to be given you, and killed the Lord of life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses; and his name hath made this man sound, whom you see and know—through faith in his name, and the faith which is by him, hath given to him this perfect health of his whole body, in the presence of you all. And now, brethren, I know that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your governors; but those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath thus fulfilled."

19th verse—"Amend your lives, therefore, and turn that your sinns may be put away, when the time of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord. And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must contain until the time that all things be restored which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets, since the world began."

Romans vi. 3, (and note)—"There are three parts of this sanctification, to wit: the death of the old man or sin, his burial, and the re-

surrection of the new man ascending into us from the virtue of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, of which benefit our baptism is the sign and pledge." No author named; but the note, being at the bottom of the page, is entitled to respect, for antiquity's sake—it shows the opinion entertained then, 1615.

Col. ii. 12, 13—(Note, again) "One end of baptism is the death and burial of the old man, and that by the mighty power of God only, whose virtue we lay hold on by faith in the death and resurrection of Christ.

"Another end of baptism is, that we which were dead in sin might obtain free remission of sins, and eternal life, through faith in Christ who died for us."

1 Cor. 16 to 20—"Concerning the gathering for the saints, as I have ordained in the churches of Gallacia, so do ye also, every first day of the week let every one of you put aside by himself and lay up, as God hath prospered him, that then there be no gathering when I come."

Titus iii. 3 & 6 inclusive—"For we ourselves also were in times past unwise, disobedient, deceived, serving the lusts and divers pleasures, living in maliciousness and envy, hateful and hating one another; but when that bountifulness and that love of God our Saviour toward man apeared, not by the works of righteousness which we had done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of the new birth and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

1 Peter iii. 21—"Whereof the baptism that now is answering that figure, (which is not a putting away of the filth of the flesh, but a confident demanding which a good conscience maketh to God,) saveth us also by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Heb. xi. 1—"Now faith is the ground of things which are hoped for, and the evidence of things which are not seen."

Gal. iii. 2—"This only would I learn of you, received ye the Spirit by the works of the law? or by the hearing of faith preached? 5. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it through the works of the law? or by the hearing of faith preached?

John iii. last verse—"He that believeth in the son hath everlasting life; and he that obeyeth not the son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Taken from the ancient book, puplished as stated in 1615, by the King's Printer, London, found in possession of Asa R. Runyon, and James M. Runyon, of Mayslick. Oct. 5th, 1831.

WALKER REID.

We examined and compared the above quotations with the original, as Walker Reid copied the same.

J. M. RUNYON,
ASA R. RUNYON.

HUMPHREY MARSHALL, *Esq.*

Mr. MARSHALL has forwarded nearly nine pages of closely written manuscript on the subject of *contradictions* and *falsehoods* in the narratives of the Evangelists. His claims for the insertion of this document appear to be founded on the several letters I have addressed him on the subject of his treatise on the debate with Mr. Owen. The rationality and validity of this claim we cannot discern.

Without consulting me or the public, he wrote and published his animadversions on the debate. Without consulting him I have written and published a series of letters in reply to the prominent matters in his pamphlet. This gave him no ground to expect that I would become the publisher of every thing he might hereafter write upon the subject. But as I had, I think, detected and exposed the fallacies of his theory of contradictions, I gratuitously tendered to him an opportunity in these pages of making an effort to sustain any one contradiction. He made his selection, presented his contradiction, and we have examined it. But he is not willing that this matter should end here, and demands the publication not only of a defence of his contradiction, but introduces a number of new alleged falsehoods and contradictions, mingled with much low and vulgar abuse. A just regard to common decency, and to the pledge we have given the public, forbids the publication of this last performance. As it comes not within the purview of the tender we made Mr. Marshal of our pages, and as he can have recourse to the same medium through which he made his original attack, he will excuse us for declining to insert his late communication. We have already paid considerable attention to himself and others who are more disposed to kick against the spurs than to accept eternal life, who are slow to learn the lesson taught by Voltaire, Hume, Volney, Paine, and others, who wasted their energies, ruined their reputation, made greater cowards of themselves by sharpening the sting of death, and illustrated how impotent all genius, wit, talent, and tact to weaken or impair the evidences of a religion, which, like the pure gold, shine most bright when most severely tried. Should he, however, or any other inventor or discoverer of contradictions furnish any thing worthy of notice, while we control a press we hope to be found faithful at our post.

EDITOR.

MESSRS. RIDER AND BOOTH.

THESE gentlemen, who were led away with the delusions of Smith's book of Mormon, have publicly renounced the delusion, and returned to the societies from which they had seceded. The latter gentleman has published in a Paynesville Telegraph of last month his renunciation of Mormonism. He had travelled *one thousand miles* in quest of the site for the New Jerusalem, in company with Smith and his Prophets. While on this tour his eyes were opened; and in his letter to a Methodist brother, of September 12, he avers, that the conviction became to him irresistible that the plotters of this

mercenary and wicked scheme design "the establishment of a society in Missouri, over which the contrivers of this delusive system are to possess unlimited and despotic sway,"

EDITOR.

REAL AND RELATIVE CHANGE.

AN objection will be made to a saying in the "*Extra Defended*," page 8, viz. "*There is no change more real than a relative change.*" *Real* change, it is presumed, is a change in the thing; and *relative* change is a change in the relation of the thing. For example, an apple while green upon the tree, and when mellow in the hand, has been changed both relatively and really. A change has taken place in the apple as well as in the position or relation of the apple. All this conceded, and what follows? Why, that the above saying cannot be sustained, unless some other meaning be attached to the terms *real* and *relative*. *Real*, as defined by Walker and others, is "not fictitious, not imaginary, true, genuine." In this acceptation of the word, the above saying is obviously correct. But in the "*Extra Examined*" the term was used constructively to mean that which is inward and moral contrasted with that which is outward and natural, or not moral This was the position which we oppugned. A relative change may be either inward or outward, moral or natural, and this is true of a real change; and, therefore, as used by the author of the "*Extra Examined*," there is no change more real than a relative change.

But in strict philosophic propriety, a real change denotes a change in the thing in relation to itself; while a relative change denotes a change of the thing in reference to other things. For example, a change of the words in a book is a real change, because the relation of the words to each other in the book is changed, and thereby the meaning of the book; but the placing of this book in a new shelf is only a change in relation to other books. So of the elements in animals and vegetables. Any change in these is a change of the animal or vegetable; but yet in the most real change of which we can form an idea, there is nothing but a change of relation. And let me add, if we must contrast these words, the most real changes in the universe are the effects of relative changes. The birth and death of a child are both relative changes, but what changes are more real than those which follow from these relative changes! And justification or pardon, it is admitted, is but a relative change; but what real changes are consequent upon it?

EDITOR.

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT—*Part* 5.

Austin.—SINCE our last interview I have read Mr. Broaddus' remarks upon divine influence in the salvation of men, appended to his "*Extra Examined*;" and if you will attend to the whole of it now, I will select such passages of it as appear most plausible.

Timothy.—I am too unwell at this time closely to examine any subject; but as we have met agreeably to appointment, I will hear your remarks upon any part of it.

A. I will, then, read you his "postscript," which I think is a very specious refutation of an argument which occurs on the 484th page of vol. 1 of your periodical.

T. I will attentively hear it.

A. It will be found on the 55th and 56th pages of the "*Extra Examined*," and thus reads:—

"An argument occurs, p. 484, vol. 1 of the Harbinger, the strength of which I wish to bring to the test; because the author seems to brandish it in triumph, as conceiving it to be irresistible.

It is intended to expose the idea of what Mr. C. calls "physical operations;" and thus it stands—

"Satan has an honor bestowed upon him by the mystic spiritualizers, to which he is not entitled. They represent him as wiser and more puissant than the Almighty. They say he could subvert and ruin the race of men by *his word*, without any physical operation on the body or soul of man; but God cannot restore or save man by *his word*, without the use of other weapons than Satan employed against him. Satan's bow and arrow, his sling and stone, say they, call for the artillery, all the munitions of Heaven, physical and moral."

For the application of the term "physical" to those operations on the soul which produce moral effects, I have (as before observed) no partiality. It is for the fact of spiritual operations that I contend; and considering all such operations—all, except the moral influence of the word, as included by Mr. C. under the term "physical;" I proceed to try the validity of this argument. Its whole force is, I think, fairly presented in the following proposition:

Satan used only his *word* for the ruin of man, without any other operation or influence; and God has occasion for nothing more than *his* word, for the recovery of man. To represent the case otherwise, and maintain that other measures must be resorted to for man's recovery, is to represent Satan as being wiser and more powerful than the Almighty. On this argument I remark—

1. That it begs the question, by taking for granted what is not allowed; namely, that there was no other influence made use of in the original temptation than the *word* of Satan. What spiritual influence might have been addressed to the soul, in that case, we do not know; but this we know, that if Satan tempts not but by his word, he does not tempt us now at all. But if we even allow that there was no other influence in the case alluded to than that of Satan's word, then I remark—

2 That the argument founded on this position is fallacious. Were it said that Satan was able to effect the ruin of man, and God was unable to effect his restoration, then might there be some palpable force in the deduction that Satan is represented "as wiser and more puissant than the Almighty." But because it was found requisite to use "other weapons than Satan employed"—measures of another and a more powerful sort, this consequence does not follow. White linen is easily soiled by foul fingers: but it requires soap and water to cleanse it from the stain. If still it be insisted on that the word of Satan produced the ruin of man, and the word of the Almighty ought to be considered sufficient for his restoration, then I remark—

3. That the argument here used by Mr. C. in support of his favorite view may be adopted by a Socinian, or even a Deist, and with equal propriety be brought to bear on the great point at issue between such a character and the Christian. Let us see.

Deist. I maintain that you Christians "bestow an honor on Satan" (if indeed there be such a being) "to which he is not entitled."

Christian. How?

Deist. You "represent him as wiser and more puissant than the Almighty."

Christian. You are surely mistaken! How do you make it appear?

Deist. You say "he could subvert and ruin the race of men by his *word*," without any other operation; "but that God cannot restore or save man by *his* word, without the use of other weapons than Satan employed against him."

Christian. Please explain yourself.

Deist. Why you put all Heaven in requisition for the recovery of man, whose ruin was originally effected merely by the *word* of Satan. Angels must carry messages to the world;—prophets must be inspired from above;—the Son of God himself must become incarnate and die on the cross;—the word of God must be published abroad;—the Spirit of God must hold intercourse with men;—and then, after all, this formidable Satan must be bound with a mighty chain, before your glorious millennial state can bless the world. Sir, you make "Satan's bow and arrow, his sling and stone, to call for the artillery, all the munitions of Heaven, physical and moral!"

Christian. Ah, Sir! I wish you would rightly consider the evil of sin—the holiness of God—and the depraved and ruined state of man; and withal, how much easier it is to *destroy* than to *restore:* you would then see cause, instead of caviling, to adore the grace which is displayed in this mighty expenditure for the recovery of the wretched delinquent.

The reader will judge whether in this little dialogue there is not a fair application of Mr. C's argument;—and here I leave it."

T. It is a palpable mistake of the whole matter to which he al'udes. To discover it you have only to observe—

That in effecting the apostacy of our progenitors, the word of Satan was the immediate instrument which he used. But this word was only the consummation of his plan. He premeditated the scheme. He assumed the form of a serpent. He placed himself within hearing of the woman, and made himself acquainted with her whole constitution, mental, moral, and physical, and sought out arguments suitable to her nature and circumstances. But in effecting her apostacy he simply employed his word. Now whether your author, friend Austin, has fairly met this view of the question, or whether he has substituted a version of his own, is left to your sober decision.

A. It seems as if he understood you as asserting that Satan's word, because the only immediate instrument, was the only means which he employed in the whole project; whereas you represent it as but the instrument of apostacy, as the word of God is the immediate instrument of salvation. So I understand you; and you disapproved the system which represents the word of God as not the consummation of God's wisdom and power in effecting our restoration, because it gave to Satan more honor than to God, who made his word the consummation of his wisdom and power in the seduction of man.

T. This is the fair construction of the whole matter, as stated in vol. 1, page 484. Instead of which, your author makes a new version, and in his dialogue defeats the phantom he supposed me to create, but in reality a creature of his own creation.

A. I see a beauty in this similitude which I saw not before. The adversary only made his arguments to the woman the termination of his project, the accomplishment of his scheme; so the gospel is the termination of the great scheme of redemption and the accomplish

ment of it in the work of conversion. This saves your illustration from the exceptions found in the mouth of your friend Andrew's Deist, and turns the argument still more forcibly against his assumption that both Satan in the subversion, and God in the restoration of man, used some physical or inexplicable power antecedently to his word, or concurrently with it.

T. But, my good friend, indisposition forbids my prosecution of this subject. Will you defer the farther examination of it till another interview?

A. Agreed. Then let us bring it to a close.

EDITOR.

CALUMNIES CIRCULATED IN IRELAND

TO RETARD THE PROGRESS OF REFORMATION IN THAT COUNTRY.

Extracts from a correspondent, dated May 6, 1831.

"Mr. *Alexander Carson*, of Tubermore, is using all the influence he is possessed of to prevent the circulation of your works. He every where affirms that you are an *Arian;* so that when I and some of my friends recommend the perusal of your writings to the people at large, or to the disciples in particular, we hear nothing but the cry of "Arianism," "Socinianism," &c. When we deny that you maintain the principles of any man, and bring forward your writings as proof, the reply generally is, "Oh! Mr. Carson says he is an Arian, and he would not assert a falsehood. There is no necessity for us to examine the writings of a man whom Mr. Carson pronounces unsound in the faith." And as an instance of the injury Mr. Carson is doing you in this country, let me say, that a justly esteemed brother, who has labored zealously and extensively in the cause of God in this country for the past 25 years, is so prejudiced against you through Mr. Carson's representations, that he will not read a page of your works, though repeatedly requested to do so; and I am sorry to add that he too is using his influence against you by giving circulation to Mr. Carson's assertions."

"A Mr. *William Edmunds*, of New York, in a letter to one of my brothers, says, 'I am sorry to learn that Campbell's works have obtained among you, as I conceive him to be the greatest enemy ever Jesus Christ had in the world."

MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

D F Newton, Fife's, Va. paid vol 2 for S Pettit and T Spurlock. J Jackson, Jetersvill, Va. vol 2 for W C Jackson, and vols 1 and 2 for himself. F V Sutton, White Chimneys, Va. vol 2 for C Coleman and J Bowers, and 1 dollar on vol 1 for J Woolfolk. S G Earle, Earle's Store, S. C. vol 2 for S Hymen and S Clannahan. J Ficklin, Lexington, Ky. vol 2 for S Bryan, H Coons, T S Graves, A Gibony, J D Hager, W Vanpelt, J Bristoe, R Hunt, and J Bogers. G Archer, Decatur, Ohio, vol 2 for B Sutton, G Edwards, A Mc Macken, J McConles, W Pickrall, and himself. G Davenport, Somerton, Ohio, vols 1 and 2. P Price, Middletown, Ohio, vol 2. N Snedeker, Union-

town, Ohio, vol 2. R Howard, Florence, Ohio, vol 2. T J Douthet, Mulloy's, Ten. vols 1 and 2 for W N mmo, and vol 1 for D Corkran, J Rife, himself, and 50 cents for T Williams. W Ficklin, Elizaville, Ky. vol 2 for J Evans, W Threlkild, E Threlkild, and A Saxton. G W Nuckolls, Shelbyville, Ky. vol 1 for R Glass, M Redding, and J Cox; vol 2 for J Richardson, and vols 1 and 2 for M Hopewood, and P Mason. J M Clapp, Waterbury, Cont. vols 1 and 2. J B Hayward, Carlisle, Ind. vols 1 and 2. H Ferris, New Canaan, Cont. vols 1 and 2, and 1 dollar for vol 3. C Bullard, Christiansburg, Va. vol 1 for Mr Ragin and A Snow, and vols 1 and 2 for himself. W A Scranton, Rochester, N. Y. vol 2 for M Wilcox and A Frost, and 1 dollar for C G Hill. S Sala, Centreville, Ohio, vol 2. J B New, Vernon, Ind. vol 2 for S King, D Young, T Jameson, and G Holcomb, and 1 dollar for J Clark and himself. G McCleery, Sharon, Pa. vol 2 for A McCleery. W Ralston, Bethany, Va. vol. 1. A G Wintersmith, Elizabethtown. Ky. vol 2 for J Hodgen and himself. W Poston, Winchester, Ky. vol 2 for D W Parrish, W Hazlerigg, and himself. E A Smith, Danville, Ry. vol 1 for W H Richardson and L A Thomas, and vol 2 for A Smith, J Helm, Sen. and J Schofield, and vols 1 and 2 for J J Polk and L Bacon. T Bullock, Rees' Cross Roads, Ky. paid through E A Smith, vol 2 for J B Jesse, J W Craig, J Woolfolk, T Woolfolk, T Hewitt, H Fisher, W George, and Governor Johnston, vol 1 for C Graves, and vols 1 and 2 for D Divine. J Mooney, West Liberty, Va. vol 2. J E Matthews, Barton's, Ala. vol 2 for S K Byrn. W E White, White's Store, S. C. vol. 2 for J Thompson. A Moore, Cynthiana, Ky. vol 2 for J M January and Mrs F Henderson, and 1 dollar for himself. E C Foote, Bethany, Va. paid 10 dollars for six subscribers. T J Latham, Pantego, N. C. vol 2 for M J Clarke. L J Fleming, Paris, Ky. vol 2 for A Kay and Mrs. N Walker, and 1 dollar for A Smith. W Button, Covington, Ind. vol 1 for E Bolling. W Bruce, Bruceville, Ind. vol 2 for G W Lindsay, Bruce & Polke, S D Piety, and vols 1 and 2 for B Fields. M A Stemmons, Stanford, Ky. vols 1 and 2 for Mrs D Bright, and vol 2 for E Romine and J Helm, Jun. J Degardorff, Waynesburg, Pa. vols 1 and 2 for J Price, and vol 2 for D Price, H P Fouts, C Good, and himself. W R Cole, Wilmington, Ohio, vols 2 and 3 for D Radcliff. M Norvill, Nashville, Ten. vol 1 for Nancy Owen, Nancy Childress, W Hume, W A Eichbaum, H Petway, W J Turbeville; Mrs Temple, Mrs Hall, J P Sledge; T N Loring, J Price, H Ewing, T T Harrison, J D March, J B Craighead, and J Peek, and vol 2 for J Harding, R Huston, C G Wren, H Ewing, W J Turbeville, J D March, Mrs Temple, Mrs Childress, T T Harrison, Mrs Claiborne, J Price, J Beatty, and Mrs Hall, vols 2 and 3. G Robison, Pittsburg, Pa. vols 1 and 2 for G Darsie. W McClarin, Pittsburg, Pa. vol 2 for R Sutor and himself. B Pyatt, Pittsburg, Pa. vol 2. J Greer, Pittsburg, Pa. vol 3. S Trevor, Pittsburg, Pa. vols 1 and 2 for Miss Trevor, and vol 2 for himself. J H Garrard, Manchester. Ky. vol 2. W P Young, Brown's, Ten. vol 1 for P Bruce, and vol 2 for E S Tappan, and 1 dollar for S Turner. W S Croxton, Tappahannoch, Va. vols 1 and 2 for A Barnes, vol 1 for F Tebbs, and vol 2 for R Dunn and H Young. W Bootwright, Richmond, Va. vol 1 for S Frazer, M Woodson, T Woodson, W Gathwright, A Jones, J Brown; B Elliott, and vol 2 for L N Elliott, J Bosher, H B Wood, W Calfield, R L Staples, J G Davis, G W Atkinson, Mrs M Willett, A Jones, J H Walthall, J R Ratclif, S Frazer, Y T Rust, M Woodson, T Woodson, W Gathwright, A Jones, J Brown, B Elliott, L Waller, W Booth, R L Coleman, and E T Elliott. R Holley, Halberts, Ala. vol 2 for G M Richards. O Thomas, Roberts' Store, Ky. vol 2 for L Thomas, and W Crawford, and 1 dollar on vol 3 for himself. N Barker, Rushville, Ind. vols 2 and 3. W H Erwin, Baton Rouge, Lou, vols 1 and 2 for P Thomas; vol 1 for J Forbes and A Spencer, and vol 2 for C G King, G Klinepeter, W Noble, and himself. T S Alderson, Columbia, Ten. vol 2 for C Mack, J N Brown, and A Cathey. W Churchill, Randolph, O. vol 3 for S Colton. O Owens, Cincinnati, O. vol 1 for G Tate, and vol 2 for B Lawson,

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

{No. 12.} BETHANY, VIRGINIA: *MONDAY, DECEMBER* 5, 1831. {Vol. II.}

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation and tribe, and tongue, and people—saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water.—JOHN.

Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

From the Cincinnati Sentinel.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

"*An Evil Report Corrected.*—vol. 2, No. 9, p. 426.

"IT has been stated to us that two Unitarian Universalist preachers, from New York, now in Virginia, lately in Richmond, are represented, or represent themselves, as being one with us in faith; if so, they are not *Unitarian Universalists;* for we fraternize with none who preach that he that believeth not, shall be saved; that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God: and that the cowards, the unbelievers, the abominable, murderers, whoremongers, sorcerers, idolators, and all liars and deceivers, shall have their part in the New Jerusalem, in the presence of God and the Lamb forever; nor with any called *Unitarians*, who give to Jesus no higher honors than to Moses; who represent him as not entitled to divine honors as the Father who sent him. If the Father be divine, we must regard the Son as divine also. But we fraternize with all who speak of life and death, of heaven and hell, of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as the Apostles spoke, and who act conformably to the revealed will of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. EDITOR."

The Sentinel's Remarks on the above paragraph.

We would call the attention of our readers to the above article, from the pen of the celebrated Alexander Campbell. Mr. C. has long been considered tainted with universalism—he has made several attempts to remove that impression from the public mind—because, by the by, Mr. C. loves popularity, and he knows universalism is not popular. In the above attempt Mr. C. has shown a great want of that christian candor, which is essential to the character of that being, said to be *"the noblest work of God—an honest man."* This may be thought uncharitable; but let facts speak for Mr. C's candor, in penning down the above article. He heads his article, *"An Evil Report Corrected."*

We ask, What evil report has been raised on the immaculate Campbell? Why, forsooth, there has been a statement made by somebody, that there were *"two Unitarian Universalist preachers"* in old Virginia—and they came from New York, and had lately been in Richmond; and they, or somebody else had said, "without the fear of God before their eyes," that they were one in faith with *Alexander Campbell!* What base slander was this, on a man who does not wish to be considered a heretic! Poor, dear soul, what an evil report!! Why will *somebody* raise such *evil reports* on a pious clergyman? Shame on

somebody, that has no more reverence for Alexander Campbell, than to say that two *Unitarian Universalist* preachers are one in faith with his reverence. And how does Mr. C. acquit himself of this "evil report?" Why, he says, if these men were one in faith with *him*, they were not *Unitarian* Universalists. What then, only *Universalists?* This is a fair conclusion, from the manner in which he evades a direct denial of the implication. Instead of correcting an "*evil report*," Mr. C. throws out a false insinuation against the Unitarian Universalists: "We fraternize with none, who," says he, "preach that he that believeth not shall be saved; that the unrighteous *shall* inherit the kingdom of God," &c. &c. This was fairly saying that the Unitarian Universalists preached that *he that believeth not shall be saved;* that the unrighteous *should* inherit the kingdom of God, &c.—than which insinuation, nothing is more false; and it would be a poor compliment on the good sense of Mr. Campbell, to say that he did not know the charge to be false when he made it. And what are we to think of a man who professes to be a minister of the gospel of peace and good will to men, a reformer of abuses in the church, and an enemy to a sectarian spirit, who will slander his christian brethren, and falsify their views of the gospel, rather than be considered one in faith with them? "*Unitarian Universalist preachers*" can lose nothing in reputation for the want of such fraternity.

If we did not know that Mr. Campbell did willingly and knowingly misrepresent the views of his christian brethren, to catch the popular breeze, and save appearance, we should not notice the slanderous manner in which he has attempted to correct "*an evil report.*" If Mr. Campbell dare to make the attempt to show that "Unitarian Universalist preachers" hold to any one point of doctrine with which he implicates them, in his attempt to correct "an evil report," our columns are at his service, and if he refuses this invitation to justify his conduct, the christian public will say that our remarks are not uncharitable, and judge of Mr. Campbell according to his works. No man's popularity should shield his public remarks from a just criticism. If Mr. C. can justify his unfriendly insinuations, let him do it.

We love fairness and open candor in editors of public journals: how are the christian public to be benefited by public journals, in which the sentiments of their christian brethren are so shamefully misrepresented? If Mr. Campbell cannot *correct evil* reports without dipping his pen in the essence of pious slander, he had better be considered a *Universalist*, or at least "*fraternize*" with them.

"Neither do we fraternize," says Mr. C. "with any Unitarian who gives to Jesus Christ no higher honor than to Moses," &c. Another base insinuation. Does not Mr. C. know that all Unitarians say, with St. Paul, that the man Christ Jesus was worthy of more honor than Moses? And does not Mr. C. believe Jesus was a Prophet *like unto Moses?* See his dialogue with the Jewish Rabbi. But once more—Mr. Campbell says, "We fraternize with all who speak of life and death, heaven and hell, &c. as the Apostles speak.' But how do the Apostles speak of these things? Why, just as Mr. Campbell speaks of them it appears. And how does Mr. Campbell speak of them? Just as the Apostles do. What a luminous Divine! In this shameful evasion, Mr. C. reminds us of a black man in the state of Kentucky, who had been in the forest clearing out a road, and returned home sick—leaving his axe and hoe in the forest. Not many days after his master wanted the axe, when the following dialogue took place between them:—

Master. Cuffy, where did you leave the axe?
Cuffy. In de woods, Massa.
M. At what place in the woods?
C. Wid de hoe, Massa!
M. And where did you leave the hoe?
C. Wid de axe, Massa.
M. And where did you leave the axe and hoe?
C. I leff dem boff togedder, Massa.

Now, we might just as well undertake to find Cuffy's axe, as to divine Mr. Campbell's sentiments on certain subjects: its all a *ho-ax*. But one thing we know: Mr. C. speaks of "*hell fire*" as "*Unitarian Universalist preachers*" do. See his Appendix to the translation, p. 397.

"An honest man's the noblest work of God."

J. K.

Remarks by the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

This gentleman speaks with the certainty of knowledge. He says, "If we did not *know* that Mr. Campbell did willingly and knowingly misrepresent the views of his *Christian* (*alias Universalist*) brethren, to catch the popular breeze, and save appearance, we should not notice the slanderous manner in which he has attempted to correct "*an evil report*." There is no contradicting a gentleman of such piercing intuition, who cannot only penetrate by his intellectual eye the secrets of human hearts at the distance of three hundred miles, but even the remote depths of all futurity, and who can tell with all certainty the happy fates of all apostate angels and men. Such knowledge is possessed by only a few favorites, of which I am not one. Yet still I must plead, like other criminals, *not guilty*. I had, in my simplicity, supposed that the word *universalist*, in its ecclesiastical appropriation, denoted one who imagined that all human beings would be saved; and not only all human beings, but even the fallen angels which "are reserved in chains of darkness until the judgment of the great day." This being my conviction, I accordingly said "that we could not fraternize with any who taught that he that believeth not shall be saved, and that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God."

If *all* are saved, the many who die in their sins must of course be saved; for they are a large part of the "*all men*" who are to be finally and eternally happy. So I reason. As for Purgatory, whether Catholic or Protestant Purgatory, I know nothing. It is neither a matter of faith nor of reason, so far as I am informed.

But if such be not the faith of the "*Star of the West*," its editors have no reason to complain of the aforesaid notice. If they do not hold to the ultimate salvation of all who die in their sins, they come not within the purview of my remarks.

As to the insinuations about my being "tainted with Universalism," or my "saving appearances," &c. I regard them in the same light as the insinuations about my being tainted with Socinianism, Deism, Atheism, or any other obnoxious *ism*. I confess, however, that I am not a little surprized to learn, and somewhat gratified too, that the "*Star in the West*" considers it slander to be represented as teaching the eternal salvation of all who die in their sins. I had understood them to denounce the limitarians, because they would not affirm the salvation of all the unrighteous who die in their sins. I would not slander Satan, much less the Universalists: and I know there are none so fanatical or so superstitious as not to be capable of being slandered.

But, really, I am at a loss to understand these gentleman. They talk so much like Universalists, that I would on some occasions conclude them to be unfeigned *Opinionists* in the final salvation of all mankind. As for *believing*, that is out of the question. No man can *believe* it; but he may *conceit* it, and become as intolerant in his opinions as the orthodox whom he denounces. These liberals, if they persist in their present course, will soon place themselves on the list of the most denouncing and contumacious of the sects. They are constantly denouncing the illiberality and want of honesty in the orthodox, and this word with them often means no more than one who believes that God will hereafter reward every man according to his works.

Perhaps these champions for benevolence may have reasoned themselves into the opinion that their conceit about universal holiness as previous to universal happiness, secures them from the imputation of maintaining that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God. But this will not do, gentlemen. One imagination will not prove another. Two assumptions will not prove one proposition.

But now let me tell you, as you have caused me to break silence upon this subject, that I do most sincerely regard your system of Universalism to be as *innocent* and as *harmless* as *pure* Deism. And do not think that I am a bigot in an opinion of this magnitude; for I have a hundred reasons to give for it. You have even got beyond the Deists—beyond the Theists: you are almost as *liberal* as *Robert Dale Owen* of the Free Inquirer. You talk about men being "made sinners by one man and woman eating *an apple*!" "a particular number of these *apple sinners* were [was] redeemed from the poison of the apple, and a burning hell (not of gunpowder) of fire and brimstone!" so humorously, so facetiously, so self-complacently, that one would think it is Voltaire or Paine, or the editor of the Free Inquirer, and not a believer in Jesus Christ, who speaks.

A day of judgment, eternal punishment, an end of the world, (*kosmos*,) or a retribution of all men according to their works, are with you as fanciful as the Arabian Knights or Robinson Crusoe. Such philosophers on benevolence, such master reasoners upon justice and mercy, such sagacious interpreters of prophecy, such profound critics upon language and scripture style, may, indeed, with impunity and the hope of *future* holiness, laugh at the silly orthodox who know no better than that "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul of man who does evil," Jew or Gentile, Universalist or Limitarian. Philosophers, linguists, and critics like you, who have such sublime conceptions of Deity, and of the Devil, may take your passage in the chariot of the Sun, scamper along the Milky Way, and spit upon those poor two-legged animals who trudge in the ditch, according to the following parable, taken from your *Sentinel* of October 1, quoted from the *Gospel Anchor*:—

"THE GOOD OLD WAY.

"It is often urged as an objection to the doctrine of universal grace, that prudence should induce us to prefer the old way, even if Universalism is true.

If you are right, says the objector, we shall be safe; but should we be right, where will you be? The silly excuse of continuing where we are, because it leads us safely, we shall endeavor to illustrate. Two persons proceed on a journey to a distant town; one takes a pleasant and dry road, and the other chooses the ditch that runs along side. We will distinguish the man in the road by the name of Universalist, and the man in the ditch as one of our limitarian brethren. We will institute a dialogue between them, on the merits of their peculiar choice:—

"Friend," says the Universalist, "let me recommend you to leave that ditch, and accompany me on the road. You manage but indifferently, sometimes sticking in the mud, and frequently stumbling; besides all this inconvenience, you will be so dirty with that filthy mud, that when you arrive in town, you will be obliged to borrow or buy clothes before you can be admitted into decent company."

"To this reasonable request the orthodox brother thus replies: "Friend, the arguments you use to induce me to change my course, may appear plausible enough; but I must beg leave to decline them, for several weighty reasons, which I shall proceed to state to you. In the first place, then, it is admitted on all hands, and even by yourself, that this ditch *does* lead to the town; so far, then, I am safe. In the second place, you have no better authority than the road guide, that the path which you have chosen will conduct you to your journey's end. And in the third place, I shall offer you an unanswerable argument in proof of the propriety of my choice. It is this: My father, my grandfather, and my great-grand-father, and their generations before them, always travelled in the ditch. I have, therefore, made up my mind, and am resolved to stick to the *mud*."

"It is in vain that the Universalist brother assures him that both roads lead to the same place; that even if he should be mistaken, there was nothing easier than sliding back into his ditch; that because his forefathers, before improvement and knowledge opened the way, walked in the mire, that was no reason now that he should; it is all to no purpose to reason the point with him; he has made up his mind; he shuts his ears against all arguments, he is rigidly orthodox, and you might as well attempt to turn a mill stream.

"Such we consider a fair statement of the case, and it is for our readers to judge for themselves, which they prefer—*Universalism* or *Orthodoxy*—the *road* or the *ditch*."

I have never read any thing more silly than this silly exposition of "this silly excuse of continuing where we are." The writer evades the point introduced, and answers an objection which is not presented in the case before him. The question was, If the orthodox be right, where *will* the Universalist be? Instead of this, we find the Universalist walking on the *turnpike, toll free*, and the unfortunate orthodox wading knee deep in a miry ditch. Well, Mr. Universalist, he will enjoy the rest at the end of the journey better than you!! Do allow him this advantage if you please!! But it is easy for you, gentlemen, holding the reins of Apollo, to be witty and wise in looking down upon those humble folks "who seek for glory, honor, and immortality, by a patient continuance in well doing." You may laugh when they pray, and denounce when they sing, eat and be merry along the turnpike, while they are trudging slowly along the *narrow way*, which so few in old times, but which *all* now-a-days find without looking for it!

Pardon, gentlemen, this formal notice of your wordy achievements. If you wish your readers to hear me expose the absurdities of your

system, and to show its inevitable tendency to Deism or something worse, I am forthcoming. But these are my conditions:—

1st. That as you have declared your columns open, you will keep them open to my pieces until I shall have fully replied to such arguments as you may offer.

2. That you will, in your first piece, define what you mean by "universal salvation," and enumerate such portions of the Christian Scriptures as you rely on for proof.

3. That you will abstain from such scurrility as appears in the second paragraph, and generally through the piece before quoted.

4. And that you will subject all your quotations from Scripture to the established rules of interpretation. Especially, that the speaker, the addressed, the connexion, and the object of his address be supremely regarded.

Under these conditions I am willing to make an effort to show that your system has no foundation in the Scriptures of truth, nor in the reason and nature of things. *Ed. M. H.*

MORE CLERICAL DENUNCIATIONS.

O WHEN shall the professed disciples of one who was despised and rejected by the builders, be taught by him "to follow peace with all men, and *holiness*, without which no one shall see God!" Whither has the spirit of mildness, meekness, and long suffering—the spirit of holiness, goodness, and truth, fled! Ah! when shall christians learn to love for the truth's sake, and to fulfil the law of Christ by bearing with one another in love!

Here we have a person acknowledged to be a disciple, one who fears God, of good report, who practises righteousness and truth, treated like a heathen man and a publican, even by those who call him a brother in Christ, and acknowledge him to be as exemplary a disciple as any in their connexion, because he will not say he believes without testimony, or because he cannot agree in opinion with those who proscribe and denounce him. But why attempt to fasten a reproach upon him contrary to their own law, and to stigmatize him without trial, examination, or even an arbitrary decree? Why not decree first, and denounce afterwards? For the fact, as appears in evidence, is, that an attempt was made, even in the presence of an Association, to denounce him as a heretic before any congregation, having any jurisdiction in the case, either tried or condemned him. But let us hear him:— *Editor.*

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Essex, October 12, 1831.

Brother Campbell,

Dear Sir—I HAVE just returned from the Dover Association, where I was sent as a messenger from the church of which I am a member. Knowing the determination of a few of the priesthood to make me the bone of a personal controversy with the church to which

I belonged, on the first day they met I went to the Moderator, *Bishop Semple*, (who has almost lost his articulation by a paralysis, though apparently in good health,) and withdrew my name, hoping nothing personal would be introduced into the Association. But in this I was deceived. The intolerant spirits could not let an opportunity pass without endeavoring to inflict a wound when there was no opportunity of my defending myself.

Philip T. Montague and *Andrew Broaddus*, with their aids, *George Wright* and *George Schools*, *changed a quere upon general principles into a personal attack upon me before the Association. Montague* and *Wright* asserted that I was excluded from the church of which I formerly was a member. *Broaddus* asserted that although I was not excluded in form, *yet he was persuaded the church so intended it*, and labored hard to make the impression upon the Association that such was the fact. I asked leave of the Association to correct this misrepresentation, but *was refused the privilege granted by heathen governors* to Paul and others. I had no papers or evidence with me, not expecting the Association *would descend to a personal attack.* I must now beg the favor of you to lay before the public the facts and the testimony.

Such is the constitution of the human mind, that no one will deny the importance of *truth;* no one will question that in its discovery upon important matters consists the highest felicity of man. This *desideratum* can be reached in no other way but by open discussion or unrestricted examination. *Let the truth prevail*, should be every honest man's maxim. In what way shall the distinction between truth and error be discovered, but by the exercise of free discussion?

Partiality was evidently shown on that day. *Jones*, an opponent of reform, *not a member of the Association*, was allowed more than once to say all he desired to say, while I was gagged and manacled by these *charitable* men, who labored to have things as they stated. The Judge is said to be always on the side of the *accused* until he has heard both sides of the question, and upon evidence being produced of guilt, he then makes up his mind. How different is the conduct of our spiritual courts of inquisition in cases of conscience! I will give you the moving cause of all the persecution I have suffered for conscience' sake. On Bishop Semple's refusing to make satisfaction for his public attack upon me, I then received the following resolution from *Andrew Broaddus' church*:—

"At Salem *monthly* meeting, April, 1828—*Resolved*, That this church disapproves of certain views and sentiments advanced by *Elder Henley*, as contrary to the spirit of the gospel; particularly that sentiment which considers a sinner as repenting and believing in Christ with a saving faith before he receives any influence from the Holy Spirit: and that this Resolution, with their christian love to brother Henley, be made known to him.

"By order of the Church,

"IRA WHITE, S. C. *Clerk.*"

In my reply I denied I had used such language, or advanced any such sentiment; but stated that I had searched the New Testament, and could not find therein *any express language where God had ever given his Holy Spirit to any sinner previous to his believing in him*, and promised, upon their pointing me to such, I would publicly recall my words. I received for answer, "We decline your invitation to bring forward *express language*," &c. "On this point our minds, we trust, have long been fixed, viz. that no unregenerate sinner repents and believes with a saving faith, without the enlightening and quickening influence of *God's Holy Spirit*."

The church of which I was Pastor soon had information of my "*heresy*." I was tried, *Andrew Broaddus present*, and the pastoral charge dissolved by a majority of *one!* This sentiment was discussed then, and never since in that church. *I was then unanimously invited to "preach" to them.* I have not changed my sentiments from that day to this.

A second time I was drawn before the church, and was "counted blameless," as given from under the hand of one of the committee—to wit, Doctor Somervail.

A resolution was drawn up against me by a member of the church, though it was the production of several public teachers. After I met them and discussed its contents, we came to the following specifications:—

"*Charge* 1. For speaking evil in a letter to Bishop A. Campbell, of September 27, 1828.

"*Charge* 2. For holding and propagating doctrines contrary to the New Testament, *as we believe*."*

A committee of six public teachers was appointed to assist in the trial on the 4th of July, 1829. The next day the church authorized Dr. A. Somervail to propose to me to take a letter of dismission, *without going into trial of the charges.* I refused to do so unless the church would acquit me of the charges and of all moral impropriety, and that *I could not take a letter in full fellowship, as it would bear a lie upon its face*, as the church suffered one to slander me, who afterwards voted my perfect acquittal of the slanders he himself brought against me; and another said *he would never be reconciled to me while his soul was in his body, unless I would confess I had treated Bishop Semple amiss.* The only question put to the church was, *Was there any moral impropriety against me?* The whole church present voted *there was none*, except the above individual. If this is exclusion, it must have been a "*sleight of hand.*" Dr. Somervail wrote the letter *to free me from the persecuting spirits that haunted that church*, as follows:—

**These members who were opposed to the New Testament doctrine were asked what was my doctrine, and they could not tell. This proved that it was not the church, but some spirit that was opposed to truth, and preferred mysticism.*

"The Upper Essex Church, after due deliberation, hereby give *brother Henley a letter of dismission** from this church, not in full fellowship: but only they disapprove of the doctrine he chooses to preach. They have no complaint for immorality, or *any other fault*, but his doctrine alone.

"By order of the Church,

"THOS. WRIGHT, Jun. *Clerk.*"

"June 5th, 1829."

I had preached no doctrine to them, from the time they unanimously invited me to preach, to that day; nor had Philip T. Montague heard one discourse from me since the Salem Resolution, which contains the obnoxious doctrine of calling in question the *special influence* of the Holy Spirit upon the *unregenerate*. The specifications in the resolutions for which I was drawn before the church, *never were tried before the church*. How exclusion could take place by *one* voting against me and *fifteen* for me, is a mystery I must leave to those that hold with a mystical influence to understand the word of God.

I received, three months after this, a letter of dismission for my wife, dated the same day of mine, wherein I am claimed as a *brother*. All the Baptists, as far as I know, did the same. I have the letters of A. Broaddus and Bishop Semple calling me *brother*, up nearly to the time of the King and Queen Decrees. I communed and "preached" among them occasionally, and heard nothing of exclusion until last March, *after I had joined another church*. I then wrote to Dr. Somervail several times to ascertain the facts respecting my obtaining the letter and the decision of the church in March last. His answer is as follows:—

"I really think it is time to let this matter rest. I have before written to you about it when I remembered: now I may forget. *When I made the proposition to you to take a letter of dismission, exclusion was not named.* When I was asked to write the letter, I intended it to be a full and entire dismission. When it again come before the church, (first Sunday in March last,) *all who thought exclusion was* INTENDED *were desired to raise their hands. No hand arose that I saw.* Again, *when dismission was called for, all hands arose.*

"Yours truly,

"A. SOMERVAIL."†

I will now let "the church," so called, speak for itself. There were 16 members present when the letter was granted; two are dead. Six speak as follows, who have signed in their own proper name; and one who can neither read nor write, says the same before witnesses; and one has a separate certificate signed in his proper name:—

**This plan of giving a letter of dismission upon exclusion is something new under the Sun. Andrew Broaddus received into full fellowship a member dismissed, not in full fellowship, owing to charges of moral impropriety.*

†*Dr. S. is an anti-reformer, but a man of sterling principles, and no proscriber.*

"This is to certify, That we were members of the Upper Essex Church, and *present* when a letter of dismission was granted Elder Thomas M. Henley, and that we never heard a word of excluding him from society; but on the contrary, the church agreed the day before to call a conference. Afterward a proposition was made to him by *Dr. Somervail privately*, to take a letter. The church agreed to give him a letter of *dismission*, as will be seen by the contents of the letter; and we have never considered him as an excluded man, but was allowed to join any church that agreed with him in opinion; *and the question was never taken in the Essex Church, when we were present, about exclusion*, nor upon his religious sentiments.

"ROBERT S. NOEL,
"JOHN SMITHER,
"JAMES RENNOLDS,
"LANDELIN STREIGLE,
"I. DYKE,
"JAMES ANDREWS."

"*July* 15, 1831."

"This is to certify, That I was a member of the Upper Essex Church, and was present when the church gave Thomas M Henley a letter of dismission; and I never heard a word at that time that the letter was given to show what he was excluded for, as I heard nothing about exclusion, nor never considered him as excluded from society. Last March something was said about it, for the first time, in church meeting.

(Signed) "ROBERT SAMUEL."

"*August* 15, 1831."

I must now leave it to the public to say whether these men were under the influence of the Spirit of Truth, when they said I was excluded, and that before an Association; and whether or not I should have acted the part of a christian *by telling a lie to gain their fellowship*, in saying I believed that for which they could produce no testimony. Submission to them or degradation they have decreed for me. In the first they will fail, and the intelligence of society will not suffer them to effect the latter.

Yours in the Lord,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

Why single out *Thomas M. Henley* as a victim! Is he the only person in that district of country who says that the Apostles have been turned out of the churches, or who preaches and practises what the "Acts of the Apostles" approves? They say he will not prophesy soft and smooth things of them, but that he will contend for the ancient faith and order? They say he has published hard things of them. But have they not read Bishop Semple's letters to me, and John Kerr's remarks in the *Religious Herald!!* And after reading these documents, who will say that brother Henley has ever uttered

a harsh expression even when speaking of the treatment he has received.

There is a commandment to Timothy, to which reformers, whether occupying public or private stations, will do well to take heed—"BEAR EVIL TREATMENT." This is the time to try men's courage, patience, humility, and zeal for the honor of the once crucified, but now glorified King. Happy the man who can rejoice in suffering shame for the name of him who turned not his cheek from the smiter, nor his face from the lips of the scorner! And how can any man suffer shame or reproach for the name of Jesus now, unless for adherence to his word, and for the christian institution as once delivered to the saints? Martyrdom of person is out of the question under this government; but martyrdom of character is yet in the power of the tongue and pen. Let all take heed to the spirit which actuates them. If any man is ashamed of the word of Jesus now, he would have been ashamed to have been found in the company of the Nazarene then. And let the brethren honor them who most honor the Lord. The only question here is, Whether does he more honor the Lord who for conscience' sake will suffer proscription and shame, or he that will so set his sails to the wind, as to catch every breath of popular applause which may waft him into the harbor of worldly honor and esteem? EDITOR.

TO MR. COHEN.—*No. IV.*

Dear Sir,

YOUR remarks upon the 53d chapter of Isaiah next demand our attention. This passage, we understand, has been left out of your liturgy, and is not generally read by the modern Jews, in the synagogues, because of its inapplicability to the present expectations and views of the remnant of your people. But you seem to admit it as a part of the prophecy of Isaiah, and only attempt to show that it is not applicable to Jesus of Nazareth. You add that some of our commentators doubt its applicability to Jesus. Of these I am ignorant. None that I have seen have expressed a doubt on the subject. I have, indeed, heard that some persons who oppose the doctrine of vicarious sufferings have quoted the Jews in proof of its allusion to the Jewish nation; but none of these are commentators; and they also say that some parts of the New Testament are interpolations for the sake of maintaining their own doctrine. But none of these are regarded in the light of commentators, unless we so denominate every man who makes a sermon. But no matter who says so, whether a Jew or a Christian, it cannot be sustained by any thing even plausible. Because, some ten or a dozen of chapters before, the Jewish nation is spoken of as one person, will not sustain the assertion that in the 53d chapter the Prophet speaks of Israel. One saying in this chapter, if there were no other proof, precludes such an idea: "*For the transgression of my people was he smitten to death.*" Here the subject of the prophecy is contradistinguished from the nation The old Hebrew

Bibles have *lemot*, equivalent to *eis thanaton* in the Septuagint. If *he* denotes the whole nation, then the whole nation must have been extinct long ago; for it is written, verse 8, "He was cut off out of the land of the living:" "he was smitten to death for the transgression of my people." Is this true? It is obviously forced. Even Celsus was driven from this fortress by Origen in the third century. But, sir, so plain and so direct are the allusions to the Messiah in this chapter, and so exactly correspondent to the history of Jesus, that we cannot see how even ingenuity itself can evade the force of the evidence here presented in proof of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. There is not an infidel in christendom who would reject the claims of Jesus, only prove to him that this prophecy was in your books 700 years before Jesus Christ was born. This you admit. Now how plain must be the prophecy! how graphic of the sufferings of Messiah, and how circumstantial too, if this be a fact! And that it is a fact, I have only to refer to all the sceptics who have in their writings attempted to answer the arguments drawn from it. They answer them by denying that this prophecy was written by your Isaiah 700 years before the reign of Augustus. Yet you say, "It cannot be wrested into an allusion to the Messiah, either of Christians or Jews!" Oh! Prejudice, how blind thou art! No one could thus impose upon you, my friend, in any temporal affair—in any question of mine and thine To sustain this, you allege that "his deaths (plural) shall be with the rich, and his grave with the wicked," "he shall see his seed," "he shall prolong his days," "by his stripes we are healed," will not apply to Jesus; for he made his grave with the rich, and not with the wicked; and he could not see his seed, because he lived in a state of celibacy; and, instead of being healed by his stripes, you or the nation have suffered much more since than before his death. This is your objection. Bishop Lowth, in accordance with your Eben Ezra, translates the passage thus: "And his grave was appointed with the wicked, but with the rich man was his tomb." There are various readings of this passage collected by De Rossi. But the Septuagint is preferred by many as giving the most approved. It reads thus: "But I will give the wicked for his death, and the rich for his sepulture." This is, in the idiom, "the wicked shall procure his death, and the rich his burial."

You think *the seeing of his seed* imports literal descendants; but why select one passage in the prophecy as literal, when you admit the whole to be figurative? You might as well object his "having no form," or his "growing up like a tender plant out of a dry soil," as not applicable because figurative expressions. But has not Jesus of Nazareth had a numerous seed? Has not the "deserted woman" spoken of by the same Prophet, "more children than she who had a husband?" Are not the followers of Jesus from among the Gentiles more numerous than all the literal seed of Abraham? And how often and how long have they been persecuted? Your nation persecuted to death the author of this religion and its first promulgers, and prayed for the blood of Jesus to be on their children; yet he sees his seed

prolong their days through many generations, and in vain have the powers of this world and the gates of hades opposed the increase of his government over men. How many myriads of your people have acknowledged him, and through his death how many millions have been healed.

No prophecy is more full of wonderful incidents than this section of Isaiah, and no figurative representation ever was more exactly fulfilled. Many of your people have been converted to Jesus by reading it; and even now and then, in our own times, some Jews are arrested by it in their opposition to the Messiah. The following beautiful translation of it from Lowth's Isaiah I here subjoin for your benefit and that of my readers. Compared with the testimony of the four Evangelists, no prophecy was ever more certainly fulfilled: -

Who hath believed our report,
And to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been manifested?
For he groweth up in their sight like a tender sucker,
And like a root from a thirsty soil:
He hath no form, nor any beauty, that we should regard him.
Nor is his countenance such that we should desire him.
Despised, nor accounted in the number of men;
A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief;
As one that hideth his face from us:
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
Surely our infirmities he hath borne,
And our sorrows he hath carried them;
Yet we thought him judicially stricken;
Smitten of God and afflicted.
But he was wounded for our transgressions;
Was smitten for our iniquities:
The chastisement, by which our peace is effected, was laid upon him:
And by his bruises we are healed.
We all of us like sheep have strayed,
We have turned aside, every one to his own way;
And Jehovah hath made to light upon him the iniquity of us all.
It was exacted, and he was made answerable; and he opened not his mouth.
As a lamb that is led to the slaughter,
And as a sheep before his sheerers,
Is dumb; so he openeth not his mouth.
By an oppressive judgment he was taken off;
And his manner of life who would declare?
For he was cut off from the land of the living;
For the transgression of my people he was smitten to death.
And his grave was appointed with the wicked;
But with the rich man was his tomb.
Although he had done no wrong,
Neither was there any guile in his mouth;
Yet it pleased Jehovah to crush him with affliction.
If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice,
He shall see a seed which shall prolong their days,
And the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hands.
Of the travail of his soul he shall see [the fruit] and be satisfied:
By the knowledge of him shall my servant justify many;
For the punishment of their iniquities he shall bear.
Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion;
And the mighty people shall he share for his spoil;

Because he poured out his soul unto death;
And was numbered with the transgressors;
And he bare the sin of many:
And made intercession for the transgressors.

The utter impossibility of your prayers being heard according to the Mosaic institution, so long as you reject the Messiah, will be shown in our next number.

EDITOR

APOSTACY.

FEW, if any, of the great transitions in human life or character, are instantaneous. In the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms the changes are gradual and progressive. Few of them are perceptible to the most discriminating eye, only at considerable intervals. Aided by the microscope, we admire, because we can trace with more accuracy, the gradual, though sometimes rapid movements of inanimate as well as animated matter, in passing from one state into another. But in universal nature all things are progressive. From the first opening of the eyelids of the morning, from the first dawning of the day to the blushing beauties of the rising sun; from the awakening of the balmy zephyrs of the Spring to the solstitial warmth of a midsummer noon; from the first buddings to the mellow fruits of Autumn, how imperceptible, but how progressive is the change as it advances, and how manifest at the expiration of these intervals!

In the animal kingdom the same progress appears in every thing, and in nothing more than in the human family. The infant in passing on to manhood exhibits in every month some new developement, which the ever watchful attention of a mother's eye cannot discern only at considerable intervals. But this is the order of the universe. It was so in creation; it is so in providence; it was, and is, and will be so in redemption.

This progress appears not only onward and upward towards perfection, but onward and downward towards destruction in all the kingdoms of nature. The grass withers, the blossom fades, the fruit decays, the ripe vegetable and animal gradually vanish away. The full blown rose drops its leaves one by one till all are gone. The full grown tree drops its leaves, then its branches, finally its trunk. The progress out of life is as gradual as the progress into life and through life.

In religion the same progress is apparent. Repentance itself is a ceasing to do evil and a learning to do well. Men grow in virtue and in vice. Faith, hope, and love are progressive. Habit is the offspring of repeated and progressive acts. No man becomes a profligate in a day, nor is the christian character attained by a few efforts. Hence the means of moral life, health, and perfection, are as abundant and as necessary as the means of animal and vegetable life and growth.

Christians may grow in favor, in moral courage, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and universal good will, as they grow in

stature. But this growth is not attained by wishing, but by abounding in the work of faith, the labor of love, and in the patience of hope.

Conversion to God is also gradual. From the first ray of holy light which strikes the mental eye, to that full illumination which issues in immersion into the Lord Jesus, there is a series of impulses from the truth, or a progress in the knowleuge of the person, character, and mission of the Son of God. This, however, may be perfected in hearing a single discourse, in reading the New Testament, or in a longer or shorter period of time. Still, however, it is progressive. And this contradicts not the position which makes immersion the turning or conversion of a sinner to God: for it is but the consummation of the previous knowledge and faith in the divine testimony.

Courtship precedes marriage. But this, too, is progressive. No period of time can be fixed to perfect it. Sometimes the heart is gained in a few minutes—sometimes months, and even years may be necessary. But the consummation of the union of hearts is in the union of hands at the Hymenean altar.

Apostacy is not the work of a moment—it is not an instantaneous change. As in ascending a lofty eminence, so in descending, we make but one step at a time. He that is condemned to death for taking away the life of his fellow-man, in retracing his steps can often discover the first covetous thought or revengeful feeling in the long progress of crime which terminated in the most enormous of all acts of wickedness against his brother man. Thoughts precede words, and both generally precede actions. Murder, adultery, theft, and every immoral or unrighteous act first exist in thought: "Lust when it has conceived brings forth sin, and sin when it is perfected brings forth death." He that hates his brother is a murderer, because murder is found in the fruits which grow from hatred.

The numerous cautions found in the New Testament intimate the danger of apostacy. Where there is no danger no caution is necessary; but cautions always denote danger." "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God." We have sometimes marked the course of apostates, and heard the mournful narratives of others who have made shipwreck of faith and a good conscience. Sometimes the mournful tale begins with, "I did not as constantly read the good book as I had been accustomed to do. Then I did not find so much delight in secret prayer as I found before. Occasionally a day has passed without ever meditating on any of the communications of God to man, and without calling upon the name of the Lord. This led to greater remissness in other duties. I did not guard my lips nor keep my heart as formerly. I repented and reformed; but found it more easy to become remiss a second time than before. I used to meet thrice every Lord's day with the brethren. But after having once or twice fallen off from my former zeal and devotion, I made twice a day suffice. A little indisposition, a head-ache, or some slight domestic inconvenience soon became a good excuse for going but once on the Lord's day to unite with the brethren in the praises of the Lord. But my interest

in the disciples began to diminish as my zeal began to cool. I could now see more flaws in them than formerly, and less difference between them and others. I could then find some very good companions among the non-professors, and began to think them almost as good christians as my brethren. If I found myself fatigued or the least indisposed towards the close of the week, I made it a point to *rest* at home on Sunday, or to take medicine on that day, so that I might not lose time from my work; or if I had any business abroad I was sure to start on Saturday or Sunday, so that I might gain one day in the week to my business, and would flatter myself that I could very profitably spend the day in meditation as I travelled along.

"Thus matters progressed until I could absent myself two and sometimes three Lord's days in succession. When any of my brethren would inquire why I was absent, I made some excuse, and told them to look to themselves. I soon felt displeased with them for their exhortations and admonitions, and would sometimes ask who made it their business to watch over me? I began to censure both them and their profession, and would ask them if they were the only true church of Christ in the world? At this time I had given up all secret prayer, and in my family I only prayed occasionally. This soon became a dry sort of business, and I finally left it off altogether.

"I found good company in the people I used to call the people of the world, and soon preferred their friendship to that of my brethren, who became displeased with me, and at length excluded me from their society. I then threw off all restraint, and for many years have never seriously bowed my knee to God. I am now often tormented with the recollections of the past and the anticipations of the future; yet I have no desire to return, and indeed I am literally without God and without hope in the world."

Such narratives, with some slight variations, may be frequently heard, if persons who have apostatized from the faith can be induced to communicate the full history of their apostacy. "Let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall." And let all remember that immediately after Paul admonishes the christians not to neglect the assembling of themselves together, he next speaks of final apostacy from the truth. It is better never to have known the holy commandment, than having known it to turn away from the way of righteousness. A Scotch proverb says, that "apostacy begins at the closet door." EDITOR.

PROGRESS OF REFORM.

THE following good news from Georgetown, the head quarters of Kentucky opposition, is very grateful. Brother *Johnson* has, it seems, immersed about half as many persons since March last, into the ancient faith, as the whole Franklin Association of 17 churches, with 1645 members enrolled, and *Silas M. Noel* for Moderator, have initiated into the mysteries of Calvinism during one whole year. But this information is peculiarly grateful because of the intelligence.

literature, talents, and standing of most of those persons immersed by brother Johnson. While religious sects are founding colleges and schools for sectarian purposes, let it be the policy, the prayer, and the effort of those who preach the apostolic gospel, to convert the learned as well as the rude, and then the kingdom of Jesus will have its share of the literature and talents of this world. Let those educated and talented disciples whom the Lord has honored with a place among his sons and daughters, be zealous and active laborers for the Lord, and for the good of their own flesh and blood, that they may rejoice in the day of the Lord Jesus.———EDITOR.

"*Georgetown, Ky. October* 9, 1831.

"BROTHER CAMPBELL,

"The good cause we plead progresses here better than we anticipated, considering that this is a little Athens of opposition to the reformation. On yesterday evening brother *John T. Johnson* delivered a discourse at the Court-House to many serious hearers, after which two intelligent gentlemen obeyed the Saviour by being immediately immersed into his name for the remission of sins, (in the Royal Spring Branch at this place,) viz. *Dr. Alexander C. Keene* and *Thornton F. Johnson*, Esq. Professor of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, &c. of the Georgetown College. These two young men are highly gifted and talented, have heretofore been moral and much esteemed, and bid fair to make ornaments to society. A deep and solemn interest seemed to hover over the audience at the water. The increase of our congregation has been gradual. I think brother Johnson has immersed 13 persons since last March; two others have made the good confession, and will be immersed in a few days. We started at the Great Crossing with *three* members only; we now have *thirty.*' Two days past brother Johnson immersed a disciple at Doctor Wm. H. Richardson's, and on last Lord's day week he also immersed Dr McInnelly, a fine intelligent young man, who resides here (at this time.) We have now in Georgetown, the seat of opposition to the good cause, 10 disciples, who openly throw aside every invention and device of man upon the subject of religion, and take the living oracles alone for their faith and practice in all things; besides many more belonging to the various sects, who seem to wish well to the cause, yet linger behind and cling to the traditions and councils of men, the flesh pots of Egypt.

"It is impossible for the intelligent mind, however, not to perceive the manifest change made here upon the subject of religion within the last 12 months. Public men of all denominations, who have any regard for the intelligence of the people, all begin to speak of the heavenly subject as worthy of the investigation of rational men accountable for their conduct. You will very rarely hear a full grown sermon now upon special and irresistible operations, eternal sheep, &c. &c. &c. These dreams are in a great measure thrown aside to give place for the living oracles, the words of eternal truth.

"In haste, your affectionate brother in Christ,

"B. S. C."

JEWS IN CHINA.

AMONG the evidences for the canon of the Old Testament, there is a very remarkable one arising from the Jewish colonies, settled in China and India about the Christian era, or even some centuries earlier. They all declare that they originally brought with them, and had preserved in manuscripts, which they regarded as of great value, the very same sacred books, which they, in latter times, found in the possession of their brethren in Europe; and nothing appears from any other quarter in the least to invalidate their testimony. In the last century the remains of a Jewish colony were discovered in China, which had been established in that empire about the year 73, after Christ, perhaps even three hundred years earlier. Seven hundred families of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, who escaped from the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, made their way over land to China, and there either founded or reinforced the colony in question. Seventeen centuries of persecution, massacre, or apostacy, have reduced them to a very small number. They are now found only at Kai-zong-fu, one hundred and fifty miles from Pekin, and amount to six hundred persons. They had taken with them their scriptures, and had preserved them for eight hundred years; but at the end of that period a fire destroyed their synagogue and their manuscripts. To repair the loss they obtained a copy of the Pentateuch, which had belonged to a Jew who had died at Canton. Not only the synagogue, but private persons, possessed transcripts of this manuscript. But, what is extremely remarkable and highly important to us, is, that beside the Pentateuch, they preserve different portions of the remaining parts of the Old Testament, which they say they preserved from a fire in the twelfth century, and the inundation of the river Hoango, A. D. 1446. With these fragments they have formed a supplement to the law, divided into two parts. The first contains small portions of Joshua, and Judges, the four books of Samuel and Kings complete, and the Psalms. The second contains some portions of Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Esther, almost complete; of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the whole within a little, and of Daniel, and seven out of the minor Prophets, some fragments.

[*Christian Observer.*]

CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1831.

IT has been ascertained that there are now in the United States more than 12,009 churches. The principal religious denominations are Baptists and Methodists, who have together 4484 churches; the Presbyterians have 1472 churches; the Congregationalists have 1381 churches; the Episcopalians are also numerous, and have 922 churches; the Roman Catholics have 784 churches; the Dutch Reformed, 602 churches; the Friends have 462 societies; the Universalists have 298 churches; the Lutherans have 240 churches; the Unitarians have 127 churches; the Jews have 96 synagogues; the Calvinistic Baptists have 84 churches; the Swedenborgians have 73 churches; and the Moravians 56 churches." [*The Sentinel.*]

INFIDELS IN FRANCE.

THE London Missionary Register states that the Saint Simoniens, a sect of misbelievers, are now displaying, and not without success, the greatest activity in spreading abroad the venom of their infidel principles. They occupy in Paris the largest and most handsomely fitted halls, and the crowd follow them every where. The most popular of the politico-philosophical newspapers, called *The Globe*, edited by the highest literary men, dedicates its columns to the propagation of these monstrous doctrines.

"Never," says the writer, "was error more visibly stamped with the seal of Satan. Their fundamental principle is this: 'Religion is to perfect the social condition of man; therefore, Christianity is no longer suitable for society, because it sets the Christian apart from other men, and leads him to live for another world. The world requires a religion which should be of this world, and consequently a God of this world.' This is the basis of that doctrine which at this present moment threatens to make large inroads on enlightened society. It is too metaphysical for the common people, but others seemed delighted with it."

"The Saint Simoniens continue to turn to their own profit the disgust of the people for Christianity, and are animated with the deepest hatred against our adorable Saviour: they lose no occasion of blaspheming him, and their blasphemies are willingly received."

[*Religious Telegraph.*]

BAPTISM OF THE DEAF AND DUMB.

AMONG those immersed into the apostolic gospel, in the city of Pittsburg, during my visit there, the last week in October, was *Joseph Pyatt*, a youth of about 20 years of age, deaf and dumb from his birth. The conversion of this youth to the faith is one among many other monuments of the great utility of the Pennsylvania Institute for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb. Having been taught to read and write in that institution, this youth can both receive and communicate instruction on any subject to which his attention is called. We have had several communications from him on the subject of his views of things before he entered that institution, and in conversing with him frequently on the subject of religion, he assured us he had not a single idea of God before he was taught it in that school. In receiving the benefits of that institution, he also received a good measure of the popular traditions on religion. It was some time before he unlearned these.

On the day of his baptism he made a very clear and satisfactory confession of his faith in Jesus Christ, and of his willingness to submit to his government in every thing. He was accordingly immersed into Christ, and exhibited as much joy and consolation in his translation into the kingdom of Jesus Christ as we recollect to have seen exhibited by any of those who can both hear and speak. Thus the deaf and dumb can glorify God, and condemn them who, though they have ears and tongues, are mutes in the praises of God and the Lamb.

EDITOR

For the Millennial Harbinger

EXTRACTS—*No. IV*

TO pass by these things, therefore, and to return to the choice of our opinions among the different sects of christians, nothing seems possible to be done more safe and wise in this state of affairs, than for us to join ourselves with that sect of christians which acknowledges the *New Testament only for the rule of their faith, without any mixture of human decrees;* and who think it sufficient that *every one should learn their form of faith from thence, conform their lives to its precepts, and expect the promises which are there made;* which, if it be done sincerely, and without any dissimulation, the end of such a search will be the very form of sound words, which we have made appear to remain the same amidst so many and so great storms of error and dissensions, during the passing away of so many ages, and the changes of kingdoms and cities. *In it are contained all things that are necessary to faith and practice.*

Christians, disposed in the manner we have been speaking of, ought not to submit their necks to the *yoke of human opinions*, nor to profess they believe what they do not believe, nor to do that which they cannot approve in their own minds, because they think it contrary to the precepts of Christ. Therefore, whenever that *christian liberty*, which I have now mentioned, is not allowed, they must of necessity depart thence; not as if they condemned all that are of a different opinion from themselves, but because every one is entirely obliged to follow the light of his own mind, and not that of another's; and do that which he judges best to be done, and avoid that which he thinks to be evil.

Since Christ has appointed two signs or symbols of christianity, baptism and the Lord's supper, it was not, indeed, in our power to receive baptism where we judged the christian religion most pure, because we were baptized very young; but since we do not come to the other sacrament till we are of riper age, we may distinguish that society of christians in which we are willing to be partakers of it; *which, if we have not already done, we ought yet to do.*

There are some who make the sacrament (which, according to Christ's institution, is a token of that *peace and love* which is among christians,) *a mark of distinction*, and exclude from it all those who do not think it safe to submit to any other yoke but what Christ has laid upon them; or to receive any things as necessary to be believed, practised, or hoped for, but those which they are verily persuaded are contained in the books of the New Testament; and who are very cautious of admitting any other forms of faith besides that which we have mentioned. It is but just and reasonable, indeed, that we should maintain peace with such men as these; but for receiving the sacrament upon this condition, that we should embrace any other rule of faith and practice *beside the books of the New Testament*, and think all those excluded the church who will not admit them. This a religious and prudent man will think very wicked. But all they who are

true lovers of the gospel, safely may and ought to approach the sacramental table of them who know no other laws of obtaining eternal salvation but those laid down by Christ and his Apostles in the books of the gospel covenant, as every one can understand them. For whoever acknowledges the books of the New Testament for *the only rule of faith and practice*—who sincerely conform their lives to that rule—in a word, who allow of no idolatry, nor treat others ill, that they may profess they believe certain doctrines which they do not believe; all such are received by these, and also invited to this table. It is manifest, indeed, that communion cannot be maintained with him who makes use of force to impose his opinions upon others; who worships other gods beside the true God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; or who by his conversation shows that he makes light of the precepts of the gospel; or who own any other *laws of salvation than those wrote in the books of the eternal covenant;* but he who behaves himself the direct contrary is worthy to have all christians maintain communion with him, and to be preferred to all the rest who are of a different opinion. No mortal man—nay, no angel can impose any *new* gospel upon christians, to be believed by them. Now according to this gospel, he is a true disciple of Christ, who from his heart believes his doctrine, and *his only*, so as to obey it the best he is able, according to the infirmity of his life; who worships one God, loves his neighbor as himself, and lives temperately in respect to all other things. If any thing be diminished from this, the laws of the covenant, which none but God can abate any thing of, are maimed. And if any thiug be added, it is a useless yoke, which none ought to impose on christians. Such laws can be received from *God only*, who alone is the determiner of eternal salvation.

Perhaps some may here ask me by what *name* these christian societies, which I have now described, may be distinguished? But it signifies nothing what denomination they go under: the reader may conceive all churches to be named in which what I have said is to be found. Wherefore that *only rule of faith and that liberty which I have described*, is, there they may be assured *true christianity* is, and they need not inquire for a name, which makes nothing to the purpose. I believe there are many such societies; and I pray the good and great God that there may be more and more every day; that at length his kingdom may come into all the earth, and that mankind may *obey it only*.

A small difficulty may here be objected to us, which arises from the form of church government and discipline commonly called ecclesiastical; for no society, such as a church is, can subsist without order, and therefore there must be some form of government appointed. Now it is debated among christians what form of goverament was appointed by the Apostles: for that seems preferable to all others which was appointed from the beginning; and therefore of two churches, of which the gospel is taught with equal purity and sincerity in all other respects, that is to be preferred in which the form of government is apostolical; though government, without the thing itself, that is the gospel, is only the faint shadow of a church.

[In my next I shall close these valuable extracts. Let me in the meantime beseech the reader to examine this subject—"Who are most worthy of the christian name?"—they who make *their opinions of the gospel* a bond of union, or those who make the gospel itself the bond of union, and obey it?] T. M. H.

EXTRACTS—*No. V.*

WHOEVER reads over the works of that great man *Hugo Grotius*, and examines into his doctrine and practice, will find that he had entertained in his mind that form of sound words, the truth of which he has proved; nor did he esteem any thing else as true religion.

Therefore it is not to be doubted, if it had been in his power, and he had not been so vehemently tossed to and fro by adversity, and exasperated and vexed by the baseness and reproachfulness of his enemies, at whose hands he did not deserve it; he would have joined himself with those who maintained the ancient form of discipline, and required nothing further than what has been already said, the truth of which he has proved excellently well.

Seeing these things are so, we cannot but earnestly exhort all christians who differ in opinions, to remember that that only is the true sum and substance of the christian religion, [the New Testament,] the truth of which can be proved by the arguments Grotius has alleged; and not those controverted points which each side deny, and which have been the cause of so many evils. Farther, no one that reads over the New Testament with a religious mind, and meditates upon it, can be persuaded that there is any other lawgiver but Christ, upon whose laws eternal life depends; nor that any one who is so disposed, can or ought to persuade himself to admit of any thing as necessary to salvation beside what is the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, or to believe that to be true which he thinks is contrary to it; wherefore there is none more certain and present remedies of their differences than this, *that nothing be imposed upon christians but those things which every one is fully satisfied in his own mind are revealed.* Nor need we fear any inconvenience from hence, since it is evident from the experience of all past ages, from Christ to this time, that the sum of the christian religion before laid down was never rejected by any. If this one thing only were at this time required of all christians as necessary, all their differences would immediately cease; and whatever disagreement remained in opinions, it would not belong to the body of the church, but to private persons, every one of whom must render an account of his conscience to God. If they did but once understand that they were agreed in the principal matters, as they really are agreed, and would bear with one another in other things, and would not endeavor to bring over others to their opinion *by force or other wicked acts*, [such as Conference decrees and Association decrees,] this would be the only agreement that can be expected on earth. In this ignorance of knowledge in mankind, hindered by so many passions, *no prudent person* can expect that all can be brought either by force or reason to think and do the same thing. The more

generous and understanding minds can never approve of *force, which is the attendant of lies, and not of truth*! [Look at the Semple and Broaddus decrees.] Nor do they who are less learned, or who are blinded by passion or the prejudices of education, or any other thing, as the far greatest part will always be, fully understand the force of reason; nor in the meantime are they *to be compelled to do or speak contrary to what they think* Let them who preside in the government of the church think it sufficient that men, through the help of the immortal God, believe the gospel; that *that faith alone is to be preached as necessary; that the precepts of it are alone to be obeyed, and salvation to be expected from the observance of its laws*, and all things will go well. *Whilst human things are made equal with divine, and doubtful things, to say no worse of them, equalled with those that are certain, there can be no end of contention, no hopes of peace*, which all pious men ought, with their most earnest wishes to desire of the great God, and to endeavor to promote as far as in their power.

[I have now finished my extracts from "Grotius' Christian Religion." Truth never was more appropriately spoken at any time, than in the foregoing extracts. I must request the reader to think maturely as he goes along, and see if sectarianism has not laid a foundation for hypocrisy and falsehood to be fostered by them. It is well known that no sect will allow persons to dissent from their *opinions* of truth without *forcing* them out from among them, if they will not act the part of hypocrites or be guilty of falsehood—say they believe a thing when they do not believe it. Hence the noise or turmoil among the Baptists to compel or exclude their members if they do not believe the gift of the Holy Spirit is necessary to enable a sinner to believe the gospel, when the scriptures are as silent as death about the gift of the Holy Spirit, (except the written word containing all our salvation,) until we do believe and obey the gospel.

Again, they are contending for the forgiveness of sins without obedience to the gospel, when we find it was expressly promised upon obedience, as was the Holy Spirit.

Again, the special call to the ministry is contended for, when there is no evidence of such an order of men having been promised after the apostolic age; nor are they necessary to this building up the church of God.

Again, great a-do is made about a man's telling a "*christian experience*" in order to become a christian, when we see no apostolic authority or example for such a thing. We cannot but look upon these things as so many yokes put upon the necks of the disciples.

It must appear to every unprejudiced mind that the opponents of the ancient gospel are the cause of all the turmoil in society. They wish to *force* men to say and do what they believe is not true, and contrary to the gospel. By such means they must incur an awful responsibility, to cast out of the congregation men who act from conscientious motives towards God, and are willing to live in peace with all that will allow them the liberty of serving God according to the examples of the New Testament christians.

I regret exceedingly to see Bishop Semple and the Messrs. Montagues guilty of misrepresenting their brethren. They remind me of the days of Jeremiah: "For I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side. Report, say they, and we will report it. All my familiars watched for my halting, saying, Peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our revenge on him."

Can any man, possessed of one particle of principle, consent to join a set of men who "*use force, the attendant of lies, and not of truth,*" to make them say what they do not believe to be clearly revealed in the New Testament? When they have been called on to show that it is so revealed, and are not able, they recommend their exclusion from the congregation, appoint a day of fasting and prayer to plaster all over as the work of God? Alas! alas! for this generation, when good and great men, as heretofore acknowledged by all, should so far depart from the principles inculcated in the gospel, and act the part of *petty tyrants!* THOS. M. HENLEY.

NAPOLEON'S SACRIFICE OF HUMAN LIFE.

NEVER was there a conquerer who fired more canon, fought more battles, or overthrew more thrones, than Napoleon. But we cannot appreciate the degree and quality of his glory, without weighing the means he possessed, and the results he accomplished. Enough for our present purpose will be gained, if we set before us the mere resources of flesh and blood which he called into play, from the rupture of the peace of Amiens, in 1804, down to his eventful exit. At that time he had, as he declared to Lord Whitworth, an army on foot of 480,000 men. The whole amount of Napoleon's levies was 2,965,965. This detail, which is derived from Napoleon's official journal, the Moniteur, is deficient in the excesses which were raised beyond the levies; but even if we deduct the home casualties, as well as the 300,000 men disbanded in 1815, we shall be much under the mark in affirming, that he slaughtered *two millions and a half of human beings*, and these all Frenchmen. But we have yet to add the thousands and tens of thousands of Germans, Swiss, Poles, Italians, Neapolitans, and Illyrians, whom he forced under his eagles; and, at a moderate computation, these cannot have fallen short of *half a million*. It is obviously just to assume that the number who fell on the side of his adversaries was equal to that against which they were brought, Here, then, are our data for asserting that the latter years of his glory were purchased at no less a cost than *six millions of human lives!* This horrible inroad on the fairest portion of the population of Europe ended in the abandonment of every conquered territory, the bringing of foreign enemies twice, within four and twenty months, under the walls of Paris, and the erasure of his name from the records of dominion! *O cures hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!* [Christian Index.]

DIALOGUE ON THE HOLY SPIRIT.

—CONCLUDED.—

Austin.—YOUR premises and your conclusions are now before my mind; but do I understand them? There is an influence which the Holy Spirit exercises *upon* sinners, and an influence which it exerts *in* the saints.

Timothy.—Very intelligibly expressed. The Holy Spirit is now the Spirit of Christ as it was once known by the title of the Spirit of God. It accompanied him, dwelt in him and his Apostles, and when he ascended he sent it to confirm the testimony and to animate the disciples; but it never leaves the Lord Jesus. His gospel it preaches, and his people it inhabits.

A. Let me explain my apprehensions still farther. The Holy Spirit pleads the cause of Jesus by its words, its signs, and wonders. All who receive Jesus into their hearts, receive not the person, but the word and Spirit of Jesus. The influence which it exercises *upon* sinners is, then, the influence of arguments, of its words and works upon their understandings, predisposing, or opening their hearts to receive the Lord Jesus, as the author of an eternal salvation to all who obey him. When, then, any one gives himself up to the Lord, and receives him as his Prophet, Priest, and King, the Holy Spirit dwells in him, or sheds its influences of love, joy, and peace in his heart.

T. All you mean is beautifully expressed by the Lord of the Spirit in his epistle to Laodicea: "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice [my words or knockings] and open the door, I will come in, and feast with him and he with me." This is the influence *upon* and the influence *within*. The Spirit of Jesus, as you understand, never leaves him. Where he is received, his Spirit is received; where he is resisted, his Spirit is resisted; where he is rejected, his Spirit is rejected. This is now especially the case: for after he was glorified the Spirit proceeded from him as well as from his Father. Peter says, "The Holy Spirit is a witness for us, whom God has given to all who obey him." Acts v. 32. The Spirit speaks *to* sinners, knocks, calls, entreats; but it speaks *in* the saints, or in the words uttered by the Apostles. It quickens, cheers, animates, gladdens, purifies, sanctifies the saints: "Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts:" "You are the temple of the Spirit:" "I will dwell in them and walk in them." No wonder, then, that the promise of the Holy Spirit, as a resident in the heart, is given only to them who submit to the government of Jesus. "I will sup with him," I will be familiar with him, and he shall have fellowship, or he "will sup with me."

A. I have one fault to your reasonings upon this subject. You speak of moral and physical influences, and sometimes of spiritual operations. The Bible speaks not in this style. It is owing to these humanisms you are so much misrepresented and misunderstood.

T. It is a fault; but hear my apology. I never introduced these distinctions; I only adopted them. For the sake of argument with those who oppose reformation, I used their own style; I reasoned with them on their own concessions. It is not my style; it is their style. And he that thinks that I used these terms with approbation, forgets what I have written about them.

A. But they think that you use them with approbation, and that in opposing what you have said about *moral* and *physical* power, they oppose you. For example, your friend Broaddus, on page 50 of his "*Extra Examined*," chooses to call the influence or power for which he contends, "*spiritual power*," or "*spiritual operations*," and yet admits it cannot be defined. I must agree with you that it is a new way of elucidating or setting forth any sentiment, to use terms and phrases which cannot be defined. But it is impossible to define his "spiritual power" any other way than by saying it differs from moral and physical power; but how far, and wherein it differs, he very prudently declines to say.

T. Yes, he seems to think that we approbate this distinction; and what is no less strange, he thinks, or seems to think, that "inspiration extraordinary" (I know not what he calls *ordinary* and *not miraculous* inspiration) is the result of a spiritual power, distinct from physical and moral; because "moral power acts *only* by words or *external* signs." But who says that spirit cannot act upon spirit by *internal* as well as external signs? This is *his assumption*, not my assertion. His ingenuity must be admired, though his logic and candor in this instance cannot be commended.

A. Yes, he assumes *that spiritual power can be put forth without moral or physical means;* and alleges that *there is no internal sign* which the Holy Spirit or Satan can employ in revealing, disposing, or suggesting aught to the mind. His metaphysics and his theology are equally mysterious.

T. I see an error at the foundation always pervades the whole building. His mistake of *moral means*, which are motives, views, or arguments presented in words, signs, types, or associations of imagery, visions, &c. *internal* or external, has led him into the fairy land of phantoms and preternatural appearances, dignified with the name of "*spiritual* operations," which *Satan*, as well as the Holy Spirit, employs in the affairs of human spirits.

Were I to sketch a philosophy illustrative of the views which human reason can apprehend, I would have *intellectual*, *moral*, and *physical* power. But to suit our nomenclature, we combine intellectual and moral; and call every thing which is argumentative, which imparts either light, knowledge, disposition, or motive, "*moral;*" and this power may be displayed either in words spoken or written, addressed to the eye or the ear, to the mind, either in signs, suggestions, or tokens, *internal* or external. But the Bible neither teaches the one philosophy nor the other; and it would be better, incomparably better, to speak of Bible things in Bible terms, if men would not pervert our words, and abuse the public mind with a phraseology neither scriptural or philosophic.

A. You might as justly, I think, take exceptions at his misrepresentation or misconception of *physical* as of moral power. When you allege that spirits cannot operate upon spirits as a hammer operates upon metal, it is to show that *moral disposition* cannot be produced by a spirit operating upon a spirit—moulding it into dispositions good or evil, as a smith fashions a horse shoe; that moral effects cannot be the result of physical causes. But this does not lead to the conclusions which he seems to infer. Suggestions or temptations, by presenting any sort of motive, may be so far physical as sound or speech is physical; but yet it is the end proposed and achieved which designates the power. All moral means are physical, if we take into view the tongue that speaks, the sound uttered, or the impression made upon the eye, the ear, or the heart. In this confounding of things there is no power purely moral in the universe. Power is properly denominated either from the agent which acts, or from the object accomplished. Thus we speak on other subjects. We have steam power, water power, horse power, human power, spiritual power, satanic power, and divine power. This is the name derived from the agent. The tendency or result of the power is sometimes chosen to designate it. Thus we have moral power, physical power, political power, pecuniary power. These are sometimes so denominated from the agent, and sometimes from the object or the termination of the power. Human, spiritual, satanic, and divine power are general terms, and may denote all varieties of power which these agents can, or do employ.

T. Grant all this, friend Austin; but what is the use of these distinctions with the great mass of men? If our friend Broaddus does not understand what we meant in opposing the popular notions of physical operations—if he supposed we were framing a new theory because we took their terms and phrases and showed that *their system was discordant with itself*, of what use is it to talk or write upon such distinctions? If I could make myself understood—if I could speak or write to the apprehension of this speculating age, I would say, that a spirit, and of course the human spirit, cannot be shaped, or disposed, or new created, or new modified by another spirit working upon it, as we operate upon material things; and that it can only be moved, disposed, new created by truth apprehended and embraced: and whether this truth, real or supposed, be presented by spirits or men, by God or by Satan, physically, by words, signs, tokens, suggestions, temptations, it can operate only *morally* or by *motive* upon the soul. If I could explain myself at all without the imputation of theorizing, or the terrible sin of denying the Holy Spirit, I would merely suggest this to those who are teaching the people to expect touches, impulses, operations of some naked spirit upon their naked souls, regenerating them in a moment, as lightning rives an oak or shatters a tower in an instant of time. This is all I mean—all I would teach on this subject—and not even this much, if men would preach the gospel and talk of the Holy Spirit as did the Apostles.

A. Well, I am a convert to this view of the matter, and I will no more roam in the airy regions of metaphysics upon topics which I now see the Rabbis themselves can neither explain, nor understand, in their own phrases and terms.

T. Yes, my dear sir, so astounded is our friend Broaddus, that he sets about proving that "prayer for spiritual aid is neither absurd nor vain." Yes, he quotes sundry passages of scripture to show that *christians* ought to ask for spiritual blessings, as if we denied it! If he had attempted to prove that God commanded unregenerated infidels, or those *dead in sins*, to pray to God for his Holy Spirit, I might have been induced to propose him a question or two; but on this topic we only wonder what could have induced him to spend three or four pages in proving what I never denied nor questioned. Charity forbids us to suspect that he only wished to operate upon those who had never read our pages.

A. In his 55th page he gives the Holy Spirit the employment of only opening the eyes of the soul to see the truth. I presume he means the soul of the unbeliever. This is the humble business assigned the Holy Spirit in converting men—couching the mental eye, as if blindness was the only malady, or that God's light was adapted not to the human understanding; that other mental eyes than those belonging to men naturally, are needed, before they can see any of the rays which shine from the Sun of Mercy, the centre and the light of the moral world. What *instrument* is applied to the eye before the *light of revelation* approaches it, our good friend does not tell; and, therefore, I will not hazard a guess. But if he will some time or other explain his process of either couching, or taking from the eye the film, I will thank him, and then tell him what I think about his metaphysical optics.

T. Let us have done with speculations upon such untaught questions, and let us rather speak the words of the Holy Spirit to perishing sinners, than the speculations of the schools. Let us have the word of Christ dwelling in us. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. Let us pray in and for the Holy Spirit, until we be filled "*with all the fulness of God.*" Let us teach sinners that God has promised his Holy Spirit to all who submit to his government, and that he will write upon the hearts of his disciples the great laws of the new economy.

As for the *degrees* of this gift of God's Spirit which may now be enjoyed by the disciples, I promise you something which I will give you either in a letter or in conversation at some future period. In the mean time, that the Spirit of God may operate upon the unbelieving and disobedient, let us approach them with the Spirit in our hearts, with the words of the Spirit upon our tongues, and with the holiness of the Spirit in our lives. Let us not grieve the Spirit of Christ; but let us, "praying in the Holy Spirit, build ourselves up in the most holy faith; keep ourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Let us labor to disabuse the public mind of its errors upon this subject, and its mistakes concern-

ing our views; but let all things be done in the spirit of the truth: in the humility and love which the Spirit of God commends and the Lord Jesus enjoins upon his disciples.

A. To all this I will say a cordial *Amen*. And let me only add that I now feel convinced that we may be filled with the Spirit of God if we only walk in the Spirit and keep the commandments of Jesus. But on the degrees in which it may be enjoyed, I will gladly hear you again.

T. Till then peace be with your spirit. EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

AFTER the contents of the present number were laid off and mostly in type, we received the *Christian Messenger* for November. In this number there are some strictures on my reply to brother Stone's essay on "Union, Communion, and the Christian Name." I fear, however, that instead of tending to union, the discussion will tend to disunion. This was never my intention nor wish. But I discover, or think I discover, from the *spirit* of the piece before me, that the writer has a little of the *man* as well as of the *christian* about him, and that it is not improbable but were my replies to be in the spirit of the piece before me, many would regret that we had noticed his writings at all on the subject.

It is true I feel displeased with some unkind *insinuations* in the piece before me, and some uncandid remarks, as I apprehend them, because they weaken my regard for the writer, which I would not have impaired for the whole controversy. Until he explain, in a satisfactory manner, the reasons why he insinuates that I am, or was, in my remarks, influenced by "the propensity to make for myself a *great name*," and actuated by "a proud spirit," I can make no reply to the piece before me. He must be dull of apprehension who sees not that such insinuations are made in the very commencement of the piece alluded to. If a satisfactory explanation of this matter *can* be offered—if it can be shown that every man who demurs at the claims of another, just or unjust—that every man who defends himself against any charge, candid or uncandid—is liable to such imputations; then I may be satisfied to proceed to show that the matters on which I wrote are just as I left them on the 396th page of this volume.

All know, who have read our writings, that we are not wont to be fastidious in replying to our opponents how uncourteous soever they may be; but we expect, in most instances, no better treatment; but from those who claim fellowship with us as *christians*, we expect something better.

I solicited a free, candid, and *affectionate* correspondence on any points of difference. But in asking for *bread* I did not expect a *stone*. However, I will press this matter no farther; but to "the *Christians*" I would say, that I have treated most delicately, for years, their sectarian peculiarities, and have rejoiced to see that many of them in the *West* are fast advancing in the knowledge of the christian scriptures. In the East they are not so. They are now in New York and the New England states pretty much as they were in Kentucky twenty

years ago as their writings now show and prove. I have contended for the name *Christian* before I heard the appropriation of it in the West—not, however, upon the ground of its being given by divine admonition or command, as is assumed by some: for this never can be proved; but because it is the most natural to be called from our *leader*, as the *Jews* from *Judah*, and because under this name the disciples of Jesus were persecuted. I have regretted, indeed, to see it appropriated to any sectarian peculiarity; and, especially, that most unhallowed of all metaphysics about the *modus* of the divine existence.

But in Kentucky, and the South-West generally, this is getting out of fashion, and many of the congregations called "Christians" are just as sound in the faith of Jesus as the only begotten son of God, in the plain import of these terms, as any congregations with which I am acquainted. With all such, I, as an individual, am united, and would rejoice in seeing all the immersed disciples of the Son of God, called "Christians," and walking in all the commandments of the Lord and Saviour. We plead for the union, communion, and co-operation of all such; and wherever there are in any vicinity a remnant of those who keep the commandments of Jesus, whatever may have been their former designation, they ought to rally under Jesus and the Apostles, and bury all dissensions about such unprofitable questions as those long vexed questions about trinity, atonement, depravity, election, effectual calling, &c. If it had not been for this most unreasonable war about Arian or Unitarian orthodoxy, the name *Christian* would not have been traduced in the land as it has been, and much might have been done to promote the union of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ sincerely. With all such I am united in heart and in hand, and with all such I will, with the help of God, co-operate in any measure which can conduce to the furtherance of the gospel of Christ. Indeed, I feel myself as an individual (for here I only speak for myself) at perfect liberty to unite in every act of religious worship with any sect of Baptists in America—not as a *sect*, but as disciples of Jesus Christ, if their moral and christian behaviour be compatible with the gospel, irrespective of all their speculations upon the untaught questions in their creeds.

I can rejoice in the success of the most persecuting of my opponents among the Baptists, in breaking down that antichristian rite of infant sprinkling, because it has sown the seeds of all that separates the disciples of Jesus in all the sects in the land. Whether in *pretence* or in sincerity any gospel institution is preached, I rejoice, and will rejoice. No ill usage from the hands of misguided leaders, shall, I trust, ever alienate my mind so far as to regret their success in proclaiming any one truth or institution of Jesus, which tends to destroy the power of the beast and to prepare the way of union among all the lovers of the Saviour.

It is faith, and not opinion—character, and not profession, which will unite the enlightened of all denominations. *If, however, my uniting with any one sect would shut me out from all others which hold the christian institutions ever so imperfectly, I would choose rather to stand aloof from that sect than from all others.* EDITOR.

THE ARK AND DOVE.

OBLIGE a mother by inserting the enclosed extract from the Episcopal Watchman. It is from the pen of Mrs. Sigourney, better known to the lovers of poetry by the name of Lydia Huntley. I read it to my little girl of four years old, (a namesake of the poetess by the by,) and she now tells the story in her own simple way to her younger sister. This fact convinces me that my opinion of the piece is correct, and that it is calculated to do more good than all the silly ghost stories and nursery tales that have appeared since the reign of Queen Ann.—[*Mirror.*]

Yours respectfully, L. W.

"Tell me a story, please," my little girl
Lisp'd from her cradle. So I bent me down,
And told her how it rain'd, and rain'd, and rain'd,
Till all the flowers were cover'd, and the trees
Hid their tall heads; and where the houses stood
And people dwelt, a fearful deluge roll'd,
Because the world was wicked, and refused
To heed the words of God. But *one* good man,
Who long had warn'd the sinful to repent,
Obey, and live—taught by the voice of Heaven,
Had built an ark, and thither with his wife
And children turn'd for safety. Two and two
Of beasts, and birds, and creeping things he took,
With food for all—and when the tempest roar'd,
And the great fountains of the sky pour'd out
A ceaseless flood, till all beside were drown'd,
They in their quiet vessel dwelt secure—
And so the mighty waters bare them up;
And o'er the bosom of the deep they sail'd
For many days. But when a gentle dove
'Scap'd from the casement of the ark, and spread
Her lonely pinion o'er that boundless wave,
All, all was desolation—chirping nest,
Nor face of man, nor living thing she saw,
For all the people of the earth were drown'd
Because of disobedience. Nought she spied,
Save wide, dark waters, and a frowning sky,
Nor found her weary foot a place of rest.
So with a leaf of olive in her mouth,
Sole fruit of her dear voyage, which, perchance,
Upon some wrecking billow floated by,
With drooping wing the peaceful ark she sought.
The righteous man that wandering dove receiv'd,
And to her mate restor'd, who with sad moans
Had wondered at her absence.
——— ——— ———Then I look'd
Upon the child, to see if her young thought
Wearied with following mine. But her blue eye
Was a glad list'ner; and the eager breath
Of pleas'd attention curl'd her parted lips.
And so I told her how the waters dried—
And the green branches waved, and the sweet buds
Came up in loveliness—and that meek dove
Went forth to build her nest—while thousand birds
Awoke their songs of praise, and the tired ark
Upon the breezy breast of Ararat
Reposed, and Noah with glad spirit rear'd
An altar to his God.

——————————Since—many a time—
When to her soft rest evening's earliest star
That little one has laid, with earnest tone,
And pure cheek press'd to mine, she fondly asks,
"*The Ark and Dove!*"
——————————Mothers can tell how oft,
In the heart's eloquence, the prayer goes up
From a seal'd lip—and tenderly hath blent
With the warm teaching of the sacred tale,
A voiceless wish—that when that timid soul,
Now in the rosy mesh of infancy
Fast bound—shall dare the billows of the world,
Like that exploring dove, and find no rest—
A pierced, a pitying, a redeeming hand,
May gently guide it to the Ark of Peace!

PORTER'S HEALTH ALMANAC.

WE have received a copy of this work for 1832, published at Philadelphia. It contains 80 neat and closely printed pages of highly interesting and useful matter. The Almanac is calculated generally for all parts of the United States, and the maxims and rules for the preservation of health are under the direction of several physicians, editors of that very popular work, the 'Journal of Health.' The following are among the subjects treated of in the health department: Public Baths; different kinds of Fasting; Dietetic Maxims; Accidents; Public Economy and Public Health; Causes of Disease; Death from Poisoning; the Quack Doctor; Injudicious Treatment of the Sick; Costiveness; Personal Cleanliness; Hints to Mechanics and Workmen; Physician and Patient; Cider; Hydrophobia; Concentrated Liquor of Milk; Disorders and their Cure; Toast and Water; Tight Dressing; Corsets; Vaccination; Prevention of Disease; Disinfecting and Purifying Agents; the Summer or Bowel Complaint of Children; Warming Houses; Economical Soups; Alcoholic Liquors; Chinese Women; Ventilation of Hospitals; Causes of Deformity; Means of Purifying Water. [*Vermont Telegraph.*]

DIETETIC MAXIMS.

1. A HEALTHY appetite is to be acquired by early rising, regular exercise in the open air, a cheerful mind, and abstinence from intoxicating liquors.

2. The food should be eaten slowly, so that it be well masticated and mixed with the saliva.

3. Animal food is sooner digested in the stomach than vegetable; but it is more stimulating or heating to the system. Flesh that has been long salted, dried hams, beef, &c. are less easily digested and less nutritive than fresh meat.

4. Farinaceous and vegetable food, generally, is slower of digestion than animal, but it is less heating. Many kinds of vegetable food are very nutritive.

5. Solid food, or food of a certain fibrous or pulpy consistence, is more fitted for digestion in the stomach, than rich soups, jellies, and all highly concentrated sauces. The latter are rendered more digestible by the addition of bread.

6. Fish are not so nourishing as the flesh of land animals, and with many stomachs entirely disagree. The white fish, when in season, are generally lighter, and less apt to disagree with the stomach than the red.

7. In summer the food should consist principally of vegetables; in winter a larger amount of animal matter may be taken, especially by the laborer.

8. Boiling renders food more tender and digestible, but it deprives it of a considerable portion of its nutritive principle.

9. Animal food should not be over-boiled—vegetables should be boiled until perfectly tender.

10. Roasting dissipates less of the nutritive parts of the meat. Roasted meat is, therefore, more nourishing than boiled, but much more stimulating.

11. Bread constitutes a wholesome addition to all our meals. It should be perfectly raised, fully baked, and one day old.

12. Salt, on all occasions, a very moderate quantity of pepper, are safe and grateful additions to our food. Beyond this, however, all seasoning becomes injurious.

13. Eating of a number of different dishes at one meal, oppresses the stomach and interferes with digestion. This is not to be understood, however, as condemning the proper admixture of animal and vegetable food at the same meal.

14. All excess in eating should be avoided, but the quantity of food proper to be taken at one time depends entirely on the constitution, age, habits, degree of health, season of the year, climate, &c. The best guide is to be found in the calls of a healthy appetite.

15. Health, and strength of body, depend upon the health of the stomach, and consequent perfection of the digestive powers, much more than upon the quantity or even the quality of the food taken.

16. Water is the most wholesome drink. Toast and water, sweetened water, or water with a slight addition of a vegetable acid, are useful diluents during the summer.

17. Distilled and fermented liquors impede digestion; and, when drank to any extent, invariably destroy the tone of the stomach, and of the system generally.

18. The stomach ought not to be over-distended with fluids during, immediately preceding, nor after a meal.

19. When the stomach is weak, very little fluid should be taken during or after eating. Dry solid food requires more dilution than that which is juicy or fluid

20. Exercise should be used in the intervals between meals, but not immediately before or after them.

[*Porter's Health Almanac.*]

CAUSES OF DISEASE.

THE causes of most of our diseases, or at least of that numerous class which it is in our power entirely to prevent, may be enumerated thus:—

1. *Insufficient Exercise.*—He who does not spend several hours every day in some active exercise—as walking, riding on horseback, or in some amusement which calls nearly all the muscles into play, must inevitably suffer from a diminution of bodily strength, defect of appetite, and imperfect digestion, and becomes sooner or later the subject of disease.

2. *Late Rising and late Retiring.*—There are few things which contribute more to shorten life, than the habit of keeping late hours, and consequently of rising from bed late in the morning. The advances of weakness and disease from this cause are, it is true, by very gradual steps, but not the less certain to be ultimately felt.

3. *Breathing Impure Air.*—A constant supply of fresh air is even more important than of food or drink. An individual may, for a long time, control the sensation of hunger, or even the more imperious one of thirst; but life will most certainly be destroyed if pure air be withheld from the lungs for a very short period. The air is rendered impure by being loaded with animal and vegetable exhalations, by its free circulation being prevented by a number of persons breathing it when confined in a close chamber, and by the processes of fermentation and combustion.

4. *Insufficient Ablutions of the Body.*—It is not enough for the preservation of health, that merely the hands, the feet, and the face be washed frequently, but that the whole surface of the body be repeatedly purified by immersion in a bath of appropriate temperature. To all, the frequent use of the bath is an important means of preserving health, but to none more so, than to the laborer and mechanic: to such, the time and means for bathing should be afforded in every city, and every extensive manufactory, wherever situated.

5. *Inattention to the Cleanliness of Clothing and Dwellings.*—Independently of the injury which the health of individuals suffers from a neglect of strict personal and domestic cleanliness, the contamination of the air from the decomposition of filth accummlated in and about a dwelling, has not unfrequently communicated disease to whole families and neighborhoods. Repeatedly whitewashing the walls of a house, and scrubbing the floors, is not merely, therefore, a source of tasteful comfort, but a direct means of preserving health.

6. *Food rendered pernicious by modern Cookery. Adulteration in Foods and Drinks, and Abuse of Appetite.*—While a moderate quantity of plain, wholesome food—in other words, the food in ordinary use, is essential to the maintenance of life—all excess in its use, all complicated processes of cookery, and every artificial means, whether by high seasoning, variety of dishes, or foreign savors, of keeping up the appetite beyond the wants of the system, are decidedly injurious.

Every species of adulteration, also, to which our food or drink is subjected, from whatever motive, detracts from its wholesomeness. Let it be recollected, too, that the health and strength of the body are not supported by the quantity of food consumed, but only by so much as is capable of being converted, by the powers of the stomach, into pure chyle and blood.

7. *The use of Intoxicating Drinks in any quantity.*—The only wholesome drink—the only one adapted to the wants of the system, is pure water. Every drop of alcohol which is taken into the stomach, whether in the form of ardent spirits or fermented liquors, produces injury; and when its use is habitually indulged in, even though absolute drunkenness be not occasioned, the powers of life are gradually undermined, and the system laid open to the inroads of serious and even fatal diseases.

8. *Defective and Improper Clothing.*—Injury to health may be caused either by the clothes being inadequate to defend the wearer from the cold, or from sudden changes in the weather, by their impeding the free motions of the limbs, or by their compressing or binding too firmly some part of the body.

9. *The Influence of Cold.*—In the more opulent ranks of society disease is produced occasionally by the unequal and imperfect diffusion of warmth throughout an apartment—by exposure to the night air or inclement weather, after being heated in crowded apartments, or by exercise, as dancing, &c. In the poorer and improvident classes, cold, during winter, is a continued and fruitful source of suffering and disease.

10. *Intense and protracted Application of the Mind.*—Alternate rest and activity, as well of the body as of the mind, are essential to the support of health. Long continued mental application, whether in study or the cares of business, wears out the system, and exhausts the powers of life even more rapidly than protracted manual labor.

11. *Giving way to the Passions.*—Experience fully proves that nothing contributes more effectually to guard the system from disease, and to prolong life, than a calm and contented state of mind. Individuals who give way on every occasion to the influence of passion, not only injure materially their health, but are often promptly destroyed. Violent anger and ambition, jealousy and fear, have produced the speedy death of thousands. In cultivating an amiable, peaceful, and virtuous disposition, therefore, a man not only insures his happiness, but promotes his health also.

12. *The unnecessary or imprudent use of Medicine.*—Domestic quackery has ruined many constitutions. A dose of medicine taken with the view of preventing an attack of disease, not unfrequently invites one which otherwise would not have occurred The absurd practice of loosing blood, or taking purgatives and other remedies in the Spring and Autumn, under the erroneous idea that by so doing the blood is rendered more pure, should be carefully avoided.

[*Ibid.*]

☞THE occasion of the following occurrences, we are informed, was some offensive allusions to a relative of these disturbers of the peace, for the part he took in the proscriptions of the Elkhorn Association in 1830. Be this as it may, we regret to record a transaction, however illustrative it may be of the spirit of the opposition, which exhibits so much of human corruption, so little regard to the good order of society, and which is so repugnant to the general character of the citizens of Kentucky, to the courtesy, candor, magnanimity, and liberality, which so universally distinguish that high-minded and generous people. I feel myself in justice to our opponents bound to say, that I think few of them will approve the deed; and that nothing but the intolerance of an hereditary by law established orthodoxy could induce to the perpetration of such an outrage upon the political and religious rights of the community. EDITOR.

—

A New Argument offered against the Reformation in Kentucky,

And the True Spirit of the Opposition Manifested in a Simple Statement of Facts.

DEAR SIR—YOU will much oblige your friends in Kentucky, by inserting the following statement of facts in the Harbinger:—

Fact 1.—On the fourth Lord's day in last September, (which was the 25th day of the month,) after one of our reforming preachers had preached, and the disciples had remembered the Saviour in the Supper, and had started to prepare for immersing some converts to the ancient faith, our teacher was rudely and barbarously assaulted in the meeting house yard, by the youngest son and the grand-son of an old Regular Baptist, who was most active in performing his part of the tragedy in the Elkhorn Association for 1830.

Fact 2. These young men caught hold of our teacher, tore his clothes in pulling and drawing him about in different directions; one of them drew his knife; they cursed and swore most profanely, and abused our teacher with the most provoking and insulting epithets

Fact 3. When the officer went to arrest them with a peace warrant, on Monday morning, they could not be found, and he gave it as his opinion that their parents had concealed them.

Fact 4. Three out of the four parents are Regulars in the Great Crossing Church, and are opposed to reformation. One of the parents of these young men is not a member of religious society; he reprobated the course of his son.

Fact 5. It is the opinion of the public that these young men were instigated by their parents and religious friends to assault and outrage our teacher in this manner. One of the orthodox sectarians says it was the best act of their lives. Another says he has nothing to say against it. A third, a Fullerite, says if it had been in the court house yard he would have approved of the act. He disapproves of the time and place, but not the act. This is some of the data on which public opinion is founded. Our friends expect the whole weight of religious orthodoxy to be brought into court to sustain these young men in their conduct. These religionists first attempted to reason; then they tried slander, shutting the meeting house doors; then menaces; then excommunication from the Association; then one of the old *Regulars* struck one of our raw *militiamen* with a large stick or cane. Now they offer insult and draw knives Next we may look for muskets and cannons, as these are the last arguments of kings.

These young men are the children of "the elect." They are depending upon "sovereign grace," "special and physical operation," and to be saved by something they call "grace." These people oppose reformation because reformation opposes their vices.

Yours sincerely, O. U.

FABIER ON THE PROPHECIES.

"The 1260 years spoken of by the Prophet Daniel, will expire in the year of our Lord 1866. At the close of the year 1866 will commence the restoration of the Jews, and it is probable it will not be completely effected till a period of 30 additional years shall have passed; then 40 years will intervene; which added to the 30 years just mentioned gives 75 years from the year of our Lord 1866 to the commencement of the Millennium."

Now as the 1260 years will expire in 1866, from which subtract 1831, the present year, leaves 35 years to balance that period, to which add 75 years which the Prophet Daniel teaches us will intervene between the 1260 years and the commencement of the Millennium, it makes altogether 110 years from the present time to that happy period. Fabier thinks it highly probable that the 30 years first spoken of will be occupied in the restoration of Judah, (which is to precede the restoration of all Israel,) and thinks the 45 years which remain of the said 75 years as above stated, will be employed in the full restoration of all Israel, after which the Millennium begins, being about 110 years from the present year of our Lord 1831.—*Columbian Gazette.*

SUICIDE.

A YOUNG man lately presented himself to a church in King William, Va. for admission. He was questioned as to his experience, and in answering the questions propounded did not conform to the truth as to his feelings. When he came to the water to be baptized, his conscience so upbraided him that he refused to be immersed; and, imagining that he had committed the unpardonable sin, went and drowned himself. He said that if he had been asked simply whether he believed that Jesus was the Son of God, he could have answered in the affirmative; but as to the questions asked him, he could not, with a strict regard to truth, answer them as he did. It is said he was strictly moral, and under no temptation to misstate matters, further than the interrogations themselves induced him to misrepresent his experience.

The above was communicated to us by a brother in that vicinity, and furnishes another proof of the evils resulting from an erroneous religious education. EDITOR.

SPRINKLING DECIDED BY A LEAN MAJORITY.

WE stated in a discourse last Winter, in Winchester, Ky. that in the Assembly of Divines on the question whether sprinkling or immersion should be practised, the vote for dipping was 24, and for sprinkling 25. We have since learned that this fact was called in question by a Minister of the Presbyterian Church then present.

I cannot now refer to the various statements of this fact which I have seen; but the following, I presume, will be sufficient to sustain my assertion. It is from Robinson's History of Baptism, page 403, and as it now happens to present itself to my eye, we shall insert it:—

EDITOR.

"The Calvinist reformers rejected exorcism, and they allowed the validity of dipping, but they adopted a mode of pouring which they confounded with sprinkling, and which at length they actually exchanged or sprinkling. The French church at Frankfort in their liturgy ordered baptism to be performed

by the minister, who, having a table and a bason of clean water before him, was directed to *cast water* with his hand upon the head of the child. In the liturgy of the English church at Frankfort, King Edward's service book was used, and baptism was administered by *trine immersion*. In the Scotch church at Geneva the minister was directed to take water in his and, and *lay it upon the child's forehead*. The same book calls this *pouring*. A hundred years after, in the Assembly of Divines, Dr. Lightfoot was the man who caused dipping to be excluded, and sprinkling declared sufficient. When the assembly came to the vote whether the directory should run thus, "The minister shall take water, and *sprinkle* or *pour* it with his hand upon the face or forehead of the child," some were unwilling to have *dipping* excluded, so that the vote came to an equality within one; for the one side there being twenty-four, and for the other twenty-five. Next day the affair was resumed, when the Doctor insisted on hearing the reasons of those who were for dipping. At length it was proposed that it should be expressed thus; "That pouring on of water, or sprinkling in the administration of baptism, is lawful and sufficient." Lightfoot excepted against the word lawful, it being the same as if it should be determined to be lawful to use bread and wine in the Lord's supper, and he moved that it might be expressed thus: "It is not only lawful but also sufficient;" and it was put down so accordingly In some other parts of the same directory the minister is left "*to use his own liberty and godly wisdom*;" but no man in the assembly knew where wisdom and godliness were not to be trusted better than Dr. Lightfoot: and he informed the House of Commons in a sermon at Saint Margaret's, Westminster, that, though he "would not go about to determine whether conscience might be bound or not, yet certainly the devil in the conscience might be, yea, must be bound by the civil magistrate."

CONCLUSION OF VOLUME II.

ANOTHER year has fled. Another year of the writer's and reader's life is added to the years that are past, and put on file for the great day, when all shall be judged and rewarded according to their works. "Lord, teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts to wisdom and understanding!" "Fools take no note of time;" for they are prodigals of time. Christians cannot be insensible of its value. All that eternity promises to us has respect to the appropriation of time. The great affairs of life, death, and immortality are all identified with time and its appropriation. What report has this year carried up to heaven of the sayings and doings of the writer and the reader? We ask not what report will be heard of all that is done by all the busy tribes of flesh and blood; but, reader, what of you and me? What have you done which may be told to your honor in the day of the Lord's glory, when every knee shall bow to him, and when every tongue shall confess that Jesus is the Lord? Have you devoted the energies of your spirit and body to the works of time, or the labors of eternity? Have you been sowing now, in the hopes of reaping then? or have you sowed to the flesh in the hope of reaping a corruptible reward? "Whatever a man sows, that shall he reap." These are questions which fools will spurn, but which wise men will ponder well.

It is not to me, but to your own conscience and to God, that these questions must, as they ought, to be answered. To what side of the great controversy do you belong? I mean not to which side of any human controversy about human affairs, but in the great controversy which God has against atheism, sectarianism, and sensuality. All are either fighting with, or against God. He has declared himself against the sensualist, the atheist, and the antichristian sectary. By the mere sensualist, we mean all who live to their lusts, who live for the sake of their appetites. By the atheist, we mean all who live without God in all their thoughts, whether called sceptics, deists, or atheists; and by a sectary, every one who contends for any thing schismatic or heretical as respects the body of Christ The Lord has a controversy with the sensualist,

with the atheist, with all sectarian professors of christianity. He fights against them with the sword which proceeds out of his mouth. The vials of his wrath will be poured out upon the corrupters of christianity. *He that lives for ever* says, "If I whet my glittering sword and my hand take hold on judgment, I will render vengeance to my enemies, and will reward them that hate me; I will make my arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh." God's enemies are the atheists, the sensualists, and the worshippers of the beast.

He that gives his aid, his countenance, his influence, to schemes which exclude the Apostles from the thrones of judgment in the christian church; he that builds up a cause which separates the people of God, who makes a schism among the disciples of the Lord; in a word, he who substitutes partyism for christianity, and rallies under any flag or banner other than the apostolic, so far withstands God, and takes the side of him, who, sitting in the temple of God, opposes the Lord, and exalts himself above the rightful sovereign of the hearts and consciences of men.

Who is on the Lord's side? Who? He that gathers with the Lord—he that fights under the banners of Jesus—he that takes sides in this great controversy against sensuality, atheism, and sectarianism. On this side we hope always to appear. In these ranks we would fight—in this army we would die.

We have been fighting for many years against this alliance against the three great powers, Atheism, Sensuality, and Sectarianism. With what success we presume not to say. The Lord only knows how successful we have been. A good deal has been done in appearance, but how much in reality we cannot tell.

We have gone through nine *public* campaigns, of one year each, and have completed twelve volumes of wars against these formidable allies. We have learned as much as we have taught others in this long conflict; for if we have not in that time learned what we have taught, we have learned other lessons in the volumes of men and things, which we hope to make as useful to others as to ourselves.

The last year has been a very interesting one in the history of this reformation. The great principles, called the first principles of christianity, and the great items in this reformation have been canvassed with more scrutiny, severity, and interest than ever before. A greater variety of talent has been displayed in the opposition, and the strength of the opponents of reform has been more fully developed.

Proscription and exclusion have done their utmost: and the Baptists, once thought to be the most tolerant, clement, and opposed to persecution, have gone farther than any sect in the New World in excluding persons for differences in opinion. No sect in this union has published more proscriptive, illiberal, and unjust decrees, than we can furnish from Baptist journals, associations, conventions, &c. against us. And yet a few individuals have done this. I can name *twelve* persons, who, if they had exhibited more of the christian and less of the high priest, the denomination would not stand thus impeached before the whole community.

The Paidobaptists applaud them, not because they love the Baptists more now than formerly, but because they love us less and fear them more. And yet the Baptists dont see, or pretend not to see the cause of their approbation.

For our part, we cannot fight under Baptist or Paidobaptist colors. We think a sin in a Baptist is just as condemnable as in a Paidobaptist; and goodness is as commendable in him that sprinkles, as in him that immerses. We dare not, since ever we knew the Saviour, espouse the cause of a sect and stand up for its measures because it chose to proscribe. And yet there is no sect in christendom that has less cause to oppose us than the Regular Baptists.

They say Christ's kingdom is not of this world; and so say we. They say that immersion is an ordinance of Jesus Christ; and so say we. They say it is a seal to a believing subject of all the blessings of the New Institution; and so say we. They say that the Lord's day and the Lord's supper should be ve

garded according to the *New* Testament, because ordinances of it; and so say we. They say that faith, repentance, immersion, and the Holy Spirit, are all necessary to constitute a christian; and so say we. They say that men must be born again before they can enter into the kingdom of heaven; that without holiness no man shall see the Lord, and that unless the heart is changed to hate sin and love holiness, no man is to be regarded as a christian; and so say we. They say that the blood of Jesus Christ alone cleanses men from sin, and that no man can come to the Father but by Jesus Christ; and so we preach. And what is the controversy about? Because of not living according to, and carrying out these principles, and because, in numerous instances, they have made them of non-effect by their traditions.

But the Baptists and the other sects have ingeniously converted the controversy into a contest about principles, doctrines, and opinions, rather than about practices. The people are thus beguiled into the service of human institutions, because of their attachment to old opinions and their prepossessions in favor of ancient prejudices and customs. They are taught to rally under any banner and to fight under any leader who proclaims sound doctrine and their paternal customs. But this will not stand the trial now coming upon the world. "I will overturn, I will overturn, I will overturn, says the Lord, and it shall be no more until he come whose right is the crown, and I will give it him." A great earthquake is at hand: "I will shake terribly the earth," says the Lord. The things that can be shaken will all be destroyed. The parapharnalia of Popery and of Protestantism—of the first beast and the second beast, will, because the Lord has spoken it, soon be destroyed.

The kingdoms of the beast are terribly convulsed. France, England, Belgium, Spain, Russia, Poland, reel to and fro, are all agitated, filled with conflicting elements, waiting for a signal to arise and rid themselves of both hierarchy and monarchy. The political and ecclesiastical hierarchies opposed to human happiness must be broken to pieces like a potter's vessel. The word of the Lord is pledged for it: prophecy now interprets itself: the Jews are now reading the New Testament, and all the signs of the times are in favor of the speedy overthrow of superstition, false religion, and oppressive governments.

Infidelity never was more insolent, rampant, and vindictive. It seeks for power by boasting of its *liberality*, but insatiate and remorseless will be the day of its coronation. Lord, save us from the tender mercies of Atheism. It is written that the Roman hierarchy will fall by the sword of the Atheists which she has created. To this opinion I have long since inclined, and am still more inclining. France has taught us many lessons. She will yet teach us another. In these United States the multiplication of sects and their advocates have greatly strengthened the hands of *the latent scepticism of our institutions.*—Scepticism, rather than priestcraft, was the motto of '76, of '98, and of 1831. None can think of a middle ground. There is, however, a middle ground; but before the nations see it they must be baptized in blood.

But we have to do with the signs at home, and with a population blessed with the best government on earth, with an exuberance of political and temporal benefits; but how wanton, ungrateful, and sensual! The weakness of our systems and the imbecility of sectarianism to reform public morals, require no preacher to proclaim. The word of God is made of no effect by human traditions. The Lord has promised to destroy the sects as he has the man of sin. Those who will not reform must await the arguments of the day of vengeance. These are nigh at hand. "Come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues:"

The human creeds as bonds of union, the legislative councils, synods, associations, and conventions, the clergy, contradistinguished from the laity, the sacraments, the sprinklings, the holy orders, the consecrations, with all the ephemeral substitutes for the ancient gospel, the anxious seats, the mourning benches, the artificial penitence, the mechanical humiliations, experiences, conversions, &c. &c. must, with the ignorance, enthusiasm, and superstition which

gave them birth and being, be swept from the earth, together with the rulers of the darkness of this age, and the spirttual wickedness in high places, before the unclean spirits of discord and sectarianism shall be expelled the synagogues of religion, before men will enjoy the light, freedom, and bliss promised under Jesus to them who continue in his word.

The prospects before us brighten with every volume. This year has brought many efficient reformers into the service, and added many advocates, public and private, to the ranks of them who plead for the Saviour and his Apostles as alone sufficient to guide and prepare us for heaven. Our opponents have aided us by the severity of their decrees, by the cordiality of their hatred to the cause we plead. They are causing all men to see the need of reform, and the impotency of their teaching. There is no publication, as far as we know, which has been in solemn conclave and council proscribed, except it be the one we have the honor to conduct. The reading of it has been prohibited by those who feel their own imbecility to resist its arguments, however impotent they may represent them.

The next volume shall be more devoted to the analysis of the books of the New Testament—to the prophecies—to the news of the day—to the history of reform—to the discipline of the congregations, than the present. We hope disquisitions upon first principles will no longer be so necessary, as our opponents have generally argued themselves out upon faith, repentance, baptism, the Holy Spirit, creeds, councils, and human substitutes for the ancient order of things,

The patrons of this work have continued to increase from the first number till the present. But its circulation ought to be much more extensive. We have been so much devoted to other things, that we have paid little attention to the increasing of the number of our readers. While other periodicals are sustained by the decrees of associations, by the recommendations of the state conventions, by the combined efforts of whole denominations, by travelling agents, and by continual efforts of all sorts, we have not a travelling agent nor a proclaimer, that I know of, who ever once publicly recommended it to the communities where they labor, nor publicly solicited subscribers. And yet it is a fact, that in proportion as the work has been read and circulated through society, have the principles of reformation progressed. Many of our agents are entitled to the sincere thanks, not only of the editor, but of all who have espoused the cause of reformation, for their exertions in their immediate vicinities, because to them is the public indebted for the amount of influence which this work has gained over public opinion, and for the numbers who have been converted by it from the world to the ancient gospel and order of things. But there is need for much greater exertions, and much more extensive good can unquestionably be achieved by an increased circulation of the work. The press has done more for the present generation than any other instrument. Now is the time to make it a still greater blessing to the next. While error is pouring upon the public ear from so many fountains, while human traditions are supported by so many journals, should we not avail ourselves of all the means of doing good in our power, and be as active and as liberal as the aiders and abettors of human institutions. If the number of our readers were doubled we have good reason to think that in the same proportion the cause which we plead would diffuse its influences through society. An increase of our subscribers would also enable us to distribute gratuitously a still greater number of copies, and experience has convinced us that we can do some good at least—nay, as much good, by such donations, as by any other means in our power. Men may be instrumental in doing good many ways. He who cannot speak or write to edification, may, by his liberality, do as much as he who can both speak and write to the edification and comfort of men. A hint to the wise and the benevolent is sufficient on this topic—a topic which we could enforce by many strong considerations if we were not connected with the establishment.

Our labors are as great as they can be, to pay any, even the least regard to health. During the last year we have been about half the time from home, laboring in the word and teaching. About *two hundred* persons have been, by our personal labors immersed into the faith. Little, however, is done in comparison of what might be done were the disciples more alive to the conversion of the world, and the opposition less vigilant and active. No doubt they think they are doing God service while they are keeping others from entering into the kingdom of Jesus. But such would do well to remember that their sincerity will not justify them before the Lord. If his word will not justify them, he cannot approve them in the day of rewards.

We can still improve the editorial department of this work. The imperious calls upon us from home during the last year much interfered with our editorial labors. Our devotion to the New Testament for the coming year, if the Lord will, will keep us at home, and afford greater facilities than formerly for giving additional interest to this work. Besides, the exhaustion of our physical strength by so much speaking in the open air, will oblige us to diminish our labors in that department.

But the Lord reigns; therefore we rejoice. On his strength we rely. In him we form all our plans, and to his countenance we look for all success, To him be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen!

EDITOR.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS for the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

J W McFarland, Dalton, Ohio, paid vol 2. P B Pendleton, Stephensville, Va. vol 2 for C B Fleet and Frances T Hughes. J Colyer, Crab Orchard, Ky. vols 1 and 2 for E King, and 1 dollar on vol 1 for J Crawford. P W Applegate, Green Castle, Ind. vols 1 and 2 for N Sellers, vol 2 for S Taylor, and 1 dollar for H Starks. A R Runyan, May's Lick, Ky. 70 dollars for subscribers. A Kirkpatrick, Meigsville, Ten. vol 2 for H Hall and W Hamilton, and 1 dollar for W Kirkpatrick. J T Bryan, Owingsville, Ky. vol 1 for J M Johnson, J Shulty, and vol 2 for D Cassity, and volumes 1 and 2 for J Ramsey. W Buttons, Covington, Ind. vol 2 for S Button. J N Spining, R H Sanders, J H Martin, E Booling, D Anderson, M C Black, J H Graham, B Restine, J Hickman, and himself. J Cross, Coble's Kill, N. Y. vol 2. W B Sims, Cuckooville, Va. vol 2 for M Pendleton, E J Baker, J M Vest, C W Wood, and J Jordan. W Churchill, Randolph, Ohio, vol 2 for E Ward, and vol 1 and 1 dollar on vol 2 for J Hall. L Ricks, Canton, Ky. vols 1 and 2, and 1 dollar on vol 3. H Watts, Waverly, Mo. vol 2, and 1 dollar on vol 3 for E Martin. and vol 2 for himself. R Y Henley, Lloyd's, Va. vols 1 and 2 for J Tomkies. J Prewitt, Fayette, Mo. vol 1 for J B Longan, and vol 2 for J Bull, G Stapleton, W Collier, and H Boone. W King, Princeton, Ky. vol 1 for F Johnson, and vol 2 for T Rucker, W D Callaway, R S Dulin, R W Boggs, A Thompson, J A Cartwright, and vols 1 and 2 for himself. G W Elley, Nicholasville, Ky. vols. 1 and 2 for L Bryan. G D Boner, West Liberty, Va. vol 2. W Ralston, Mansfield; Ohio, vol 2. J Gist, Bethany, Va. vol 2. L Gardner, Eldersville, Pa. vols 1 and 2. A Carman, vols 1 and 2 for S Bell of Smithfield, Ohio. J Smith, Economy, Ind. vol 2 for T Burns and himself. J Doddridge, Williamsport, Ohio, vol 2 for T Graham and himself. W Morgan, Springfield, Ill. vol 2 for J Morgan, and J Powell, and 1 dollar for himself. T Eakin, Miverva, Ohio, vol 2. W E White, White's Store, S. C. vol 2. A Kyle, Harrodsburg, Ky. vol. 2 for J Bowman, G Burks, J Berryman, J R Chapline, and D Hart. P Miller, Newport, Mo. vol 2 for W Rogers, C B Minton, and himself. R Short, Goodson's, Va. vols 1 and 2. Levi Haggard, Burksville, Ky. vol 2 for G Cary, and F J Hutchins, and 1 dollar for C R Palmer; also vols 1 and 2 for P Gearhart. C Butler, Hanover, Ind. 7 dollars for subscribers. R Buchanan, vol 2 for Wm. West and Charlotte Buchanan.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.
—EXTRA—

No. 3. | BETHANY, VIRGINIA: MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1831. | VOL. II.

THE EXTRA DEFENDED:

BEING AN EXAMINATION OF

Mr. A. BROADDUS' "EXTRA EXAMINED."

NO person has evinced more candor and more ingenuity in opposing Immersion for the Remission of Sins, than my friend Andrew Broaddus. But human nature, he says, is prone to extremes, and, therefore, candid and ingenious men sometimes are found in the opposite extremes upon matters of even the plainest import. Thus some make a saviour of baptism, and others labor to save men without it. For our part, we only preach *baptism for the remission of sins*, and the *Holy Spirit* for holiness; and thus represent God as *saving* us, in the words of Paul, "*by the washing of regeneration*, AND *the renewing of the Holy Spirit.*"

Our friend Broaddus gives to baptism no instrumentality at all in the work of salvation. It only indicates, he says, "that the subject, a *pardoned sinner*, (yes, a *pardoned* sinner,) is *openly* and *formally* received into the Lord's service;" and that the pledge is *openly* and *formally* given that he devotes himself to Christ by thus visibly, or externally putting on Christ." p. 39. It is but a mutual pledge between God and the pardoned sinner. This is its moral and religious value in the christian institution—a mutual pledge of an open and formal reception into the Lord's service. Truly this is a great matter; and no wonder that those who view it thus should make an announcement a month before that such persons are going to be openly and formally received into the service! Unfortunate it was for the jailor to have been immersed at night; for Saul and the eunuch, and myriads more, to have been immersed privately; for it was to them no pledge of an open and formal reception into the service. "Would," adds our pious friend, "that all who are baptized felt and continued to feel the sacred force of this mutual pledge!"

Ah me! how fond are good men of their own inventions! This "mutual pledge," how dear to its author and inventor! He prays not that all might feel the sacred force of "*he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*," or "be immersed every one of you for the remission of sins," but that all may feel the force of the *mutual pledge!* which saying occurs not in all the oracles of God. But this only in proof of his own position, that human nature is prone to extremes.

Desiring most sincerely the recovery of my quondam brother from the extreme into which he has run, and many with him, I will most studiously in these remarks endeavor to meet fairly and fully his ar-

guments, objections, and difficulties. I can in all good conscience call him who searches the hearts of all to witness, that I attempt this with full conviction that he is mistaken in his views of immersion; that he misrepresents mine; and, that I am most benevolently disposed to him, and still willing to fraternize with him under Jesus Christ.

Andrew, for I would rather he would call me Alexander than Mr. C. and, therefore, I call him *Andrew*, has conceived a great veneration for his "host of evangelical writers from the era of the Reformation," and no doubt he thinks for reasons good and relevant. These I am sure have caused many a candid student of the Bible to err. I am one of that class. My early preachings, and writings too, might be adduced in proof of it. Less than twenty years ago I could have said *Amen* to almost every page of the pamphlet before me. Then, too, I boasted of the Bible and the whole host of evangelical writers; and then, indeed, Andrew would have been enrolled by me as one of the host of evangelical writers on "*Living Faith*," and every other essential point. But I thank the Father of Mercies, with my whole heart, that the charm or spell which held me to that host has long since been dissipated, and that I now call no man master or father on earth in evangelical affairs. God has shown me their weaknesses, their errors—and therefore I am willing to be slandered and reviled by such evangelical writers as Abner W. Clopton, W. T. Brantley, *cum multis aliis* of the same school, for preferring the simple testimony of the Apostles to all the evangelical writers in the Church of Rome or out of it.

These evangelical writers have failed to fill the churches which they builded with true-hearted christians. What shall we think of the renewal of the hearts of those prayerless, Christless worldlings, which have filled so many congregations of the most evanglical sects in the land! How many hundred Baptist and Presbyterian congregations of these evangelical converts can be found, a large majority of which seldom or never pray to God in their families, or spend an hour in the week in their closets, or by their firesides, in the exercises of devotion! How many churches are there, even among the Regular Baptists, who plead for special regeneration before baptism, and for "*pardoned sinners*" as the only subjects of baptism, composed of from 50 to 200 members, with not more than sometimes one, and sometimes two or three persons to the hundred, who pretend to keep up any of the forms of godliness in their families, except a *stale* "*grace before meat*"—who appear not, even in their forms of religion, to worship God in spirit and in truth—I can readily conceive of the form of godliness without the power, but not so easily of the power without the form.

Our greatest objection to the systems which we oppose is their impotency on the heart. Alas! what multitudes of prayerless, saintless, Christless, joyless hearts, have crowded christianity out of the congregations by their experiences before baptism! They seem to have had all their religion before they professed it. They can relate

no experience since baptism comparable to that professed before this "mutual pledge" was tendered and received.

It was the indubitable proofs of the superabundance of this fruit which caused me first to suspicion the far famed tree of evangelical orthodoxy. That cold heartedness; that stiff and mercenary formality; that tithing of mint, anise, and dill; that negligence of mercy, justice, truth, and the love of God, which stalked through the communions of sectarian altars; that apathy and indifference about "*thus saith the Lord*;" that zeal for human prescriptions; and above all, that willing ignorance of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, which so generally appeared, first of all created, fostered, and matured my distrust in the reformed systems of evangelical sectaries. Communion with me was communion of kindred souls, immersed into one spirit—congenial spirits, hearts touched with the love of God, that celestial magnet which turns our aspirations and adorations to him who washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests to God.

To sit in the same pew; to gather round the same pulpit; to put our names to the same covenant, or subscription list; to contribute for a weekly sermon; to lisp the same opinions, extracted from the same creed, always appeared to me unworthy bonds of union or communion, and therefore my soul abhorred them as substitutes for the love of God shed abroad in the heart, for the communion of the Holy Spirit. "If a man would give all the substance of his house as a substitute for love, it should be utterly contemned."

The Divine Philosopher preached reformation by addressing himself to the *heart*. We begin with the heart. "Make the tree good," then good fruit may be expected. To this point all our labors tend: and, therefore, judge, candid reader, with what astonishment we heard Andrew (page 1) preface his defence of the popular notions of faith, baptism, &c. by telling us "that the great error which lies at the bottom of Mr. C's theory, of the actual forgiveness of sins in baptism, appears to consist in *an undervaluing of the exercises of the heart, and attaching to external conduct or action the importance which really belongs to these exercises.*"—Every No. of the Christian Baptist, from the essay on "the Christian Religion, No. 1," to the last number of the Millennial Harbinger, disproves the above suspicion and imputation.

But this appears to be the error of all sects, in a greater or less degree; they set about *mending* the heart, as preliminary to that which alone can *create* a *new heart*. Jesus gives us the philosophy of his scheme in an address to a sinner of that time—"Your sins," says he, "are forgiven you; go, and sin no more." He first changes the sinner's state, "not external but internal," and then says, "*Go, and sin no more.*" He frankly forgave the debt. The sinner loved him.

There was much of this philosophy in the question, "*Who loves most:* he that was forgiven five hundred pence, or he that was forgiven fifty? How much does he love who is not forgiven at all?" Aye, that question brings us onward a little to the reason why the first act

of obedience to Jesus Christ should be baptism into his name, and that for the remission of sins.

But now we speak of the exercises of the heart. While any man believes the words of Jesus, "out of the heart proceed the actions which defile the man," he can never lose sight of the heart, as the object on which all evangelical arguments are to terminate, and as the *fons et principium*, the fountain and origin of all piety and humanity.

It was an inquiry into this matter which gave all importance to immersion for the remission of sins. The reader curious to understand this subject will find, in No. 2 vol. 1 Christian Baptist, for September 1823, page 32, 2d edition, in a letter from my father signed T. W. the first developement which appeared in this century of this capital item of what he calls "*the apostolic gospel*," with special reference to the heart. Before my debate with Mr. McCalla in the following month, we had much reasoning and debating on this topic. It was not hastily, nor crudely, nor hazardously introduced into that discussion. He and brother W. Scott, after much deliberation, concurred with me at that time in the opinion, that I should exhibit in that discussion immersion for the remission of sins, and exhort to an immediate attendance upon this institution as commanded in the 2d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles for that purpose. This was fully done in that discussion, and the importance of that view of immersion, because of its influence upon the heart, is fully demonstrated in the letter alluded to. Now how my friend Andrew, with that and a hundred similar documents before him, which he had doubtless read, could so misrepresent our views of the importance of the exercises of the heart is, I think, to be attributed to the obfuscating influence of sytem, to the obliquities of those evangelical writers, rather than to any perversity of mind or wish to misrepresent.

Once for all let it be distinctly noted, that we appreciate nothing in religion which tends not directly and immediately, proximately and remotely, to the purification and perfection of the heart. Paul acts the philosopher fully once, and if we recollect right but once, in all his writings upon this subject. It has been for many years a favorite topic with me. It is in his first Epistle to Timothy—"Now the end of the commandment, or gospel, is love, out of a pure heart, out of a good conscience, out of faith unfeigned." Faith unfeigned brings a person to remission, or to a good conscience; a good conscience precedes, in the order of nature, a pure heart; and that is the only soil in which love, that plant of celestial origin, can grow. This is our philosophy of christianity, of the gospel. And thus it is the wisdom and power of God to salvation. We proceed upon these as our axiomata in all our reasonings, preachings, writings—1st, unfeigned faith; 2d, a good conscience; 3d, a pure heart; 4th, love. The testimony of God apprehended produces unfeigned or genuine faith; faith obeyed produces a good conscience. This Peter defines to be the use of baptism, the answer of a good conscience. This produces a pure heart, and then the consummation is love—love to God and man.

Paul's order or arrangement is adopted by us as infallible: Testimony—faith unfeigned—remission, or a good conscience—a pure heart—love. Preaching, praying, singing, commemorating, meditating, all issue here. "Happy the pure in heart, for they shall see God." These things premised, we proceed to detect the errors in the reasoning and in the system advanced by our friend Andrew in his Extra Examined.

Having reduced my estimate of heart exercises down to nothing, he starts with this as his grand postulatum, just as Euclid builds his science of geometry, upon a point which has no magnitude. His whole pamphlet rests upon this assumption, as gratuitous as was his who represented Paul as teaching "Let us do evil that good may come." Hear him, page 6, at his starting point—'From this defect in Mr. C's estimate of heart exercises it came to pass that he so heavily censured the definition of conversion as given by Christianos, viz: that it is a turning of the heart to holiness, &c.—See M. H. vol. 1, p. 155." "Hence too," he adds, "it is that he considers baptism to be the proper scriptural conversion—regeneration— new birth." I have quoted these words that the reader may perceive on what ground it is that my friend Andrew begins to build. These are his assumptions. I will abundantly prove that these are gross errors, and that they tincture every thing in his pamphlet from the first to the last page. I turned over to vol. 1 p. 155, and to the pages referred to, and find that it was the *new datum* for understanding *participles*, submitted by Andrew, which is so heavily censured, and not the exercises of the heart! His representing conversion as a mere "*turning of the heart to holiness*" is also censured, because it is not the import of the word *convert*, in any passage in the New Testament. But how any grammarian, logician, or common sense reasoner could infer that the exercises of the heart are thus undervalued, is to be explained upon the principle that there is a disease called jealousy, and another called the spiritual jaundice. Because I do not define the Greek word *Epistrophe*, or the English imperative "*be converted*," by "turn the heart to holiness," therefore heart exercises in religion are worth nothing! I should not like to have any of my political rights tried before judges who thus discriminate by their hearts and not by their heads, unless, forsooth, they were my very best friends.

I do, indeed, believe that mere *mental* converts are not christian converts; and in the very passage to which he refers, I very explicitly declare that the hearts of all christian converts are thoroughly changed. My words in that passage are—"True, they do *love truth, goodness, holiness; but they show this love by obedience.* I am for purity and holiness of life in all disciples." p. 155.

The most worldly sect in christendom are those who confine all religion to the heart. The heart is with them the temple of the Lord. They care not for bread, wine, water, sacred songs, nor holy days in religion—the heart is all. To many of these talkers about their heart religion I would say, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." But am I for this an enemy to the exercises of the

heart! I will repress my feelings on this occasion, and simply ask the reader, Was there, from the data now before him—and there is not a hundredth part of the evidences to be found in my writings here presented—was there ever, I ask, a more gratuitous assumption than this starting point of the Extra examiner? In the Extra itself there is one proposition on which great stress is laid, viz: the 7th; and in this proposition there is a full refutation of this assumption. It is in these words: "Though a change of heart *necessarily* precedes, it is in no case equivalent to, and never to be identified with a change of state." —See also page 35, Extra No. 1, for a full refutation of this imputation.

Some persons are always canting about heart religion, and condemning others for the want of the sanctuary tone, and good old puritanical sigh; but into their sanctuary my soul fears to enter. Cowards talk much about valor; rakes about chastity; thieves about honesty; liars about truth; misers about generosity; and hypocrites about heart religion. This I have often noticed, and again repeat it. But do I in so saying deprecate the exercises of the heart? By no means. But in fact I have found most true and cordial devotion where there is the least talk about the heart, and the least godly sincerity and real holiness of spirit where there is the most said about it. This may be an excuse for my friend Andrew's wholly misunderstanding me; for I would rather impute an error so palpable to his understanding than to his heart.

"With these general introductory remarks we are," says my friend Broaddus, "about to enter more particularly into our proposed examination. Candid indeed! Reader, this thread runs to the end of the web. These *assumptions*, then, are laid down as his premises!

The twelve first pages, called his No. 1, are devoted to the first six propositions in the Extra, occupying nine pages of that essay. "These six propositions are admitted," he says, "for they are clearly established by the author."

"As engrossed by Mr. C. into "one leading proposition," they stand thus:— "The converts made to Jesus Christ by the Apostles, were taught to consider themselves pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and were addressed as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons, by all who first preached the gospel of Christ."

"But though we cordially agree to this whole proposition, and every part thereof, we are far from concurring with Mr. C's *comment*, and the use which he afterwards makes of it. "It may be expedient to remark" (says he) "that all these terms are expressive not of any quality of mind—not of any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit; but each of them represents, and all of them together represent a *state or condition*." By *state* or *condition* Mr. C. appears obviously to mean what the old Divines used to call a *relative* change, in contradistinction to what they called a *real* change: that is, a state in which the subject stands in a new *relation;*—not including, in the meaning of the term, any *moral* change or alteration in the subject himself."

Before we remark on the preceding, we shall hear him speak his apprehensions of these preliminary propositions—

"It appears to be in substance as follows:—

"That the converts or disciples of the New Testament are represented as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and they being

the only persons in such a state, all others, of course, are in an unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost state.

"That there is an act (meaning an external or bodily act) by which the state of a person thus condemned is changed: and that this act is baptism or christian immersion."

Such is the ambiguity of even the most definite language, when taken from its connexions, that it may, by a little art or ingenuity, be made to speak a meaning at which the mind of its author revolts. Hence our friend is more successful in his No. 1 than in any other part of his pamphlet. But let us, in the spirit of candor and godly sincerity, reconsider this matter. The radical mistakes or misapprehensions of our examiner appear to be the following—

FIRST CAPITAL ERROR.

He supposes the terms *justified*, *pardoned*, *sanctified*, *reconciled*, *adopted and saved*, to represent not all of them together, nor apart, simply a *state* or condition, but as indicating *moral qualities*. That I do not misapprehend his meaning will appear from his calling this an "assumption" of mine, and from his saying, p. 8–9—

"If *all* these terms express only the idea of *state*, none of them representing *quality*, or moral attribute; then I must own that I have been greatly in the dark as to the meaning of some of them; and so, it would seem, must have been all the theological writers whose works have been under my perusal.

"Let us see. "Pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, saved." Does the reader observe nothing in any of these terms, which, according to his acceptation of them, conveys the idea of quality or attribute of body, soul, or spirit? What does he think of the term "sanctified?" of the term "reconciled?" of the term "saved," involving in it the idea of a deliverance, not merely from guilt, but from the polluting power of sin? Do these terms represent no moral change—no quality of mind? We shall attend to them more particularly presently. The fact appears to be, that some of the above mentioned terms are indeed expressive of a mere *relative* state; but others involve the qualities of mind which belong to that state. And in this we see a beautiful fitness and propriety. It is perfectly fit and proper that so it should be:—that the *privileges* and the *character* of the disciples of Christ should both be represented, and often combined;—their *relative* and their real change both expressed, in the addresses and terms by which they are designated."

Thus I have placed him fairly before our readers. Now let me ask, what proof has he adduced to show that all this is not *gratis dictum*, a mere gratuitous assumption. He asks his reader, what does he observe in all these terms!! And in the following pages, 10, 11, & 12, admits that pardoned, justified, and adopted, represent a state; while sanctified, reconciled, and saved, frequently represent the intrinsic character of believers.

These distinctions are, I must say, in all candor, apparently made to suit a theory. But that I may expose fully the mistake in the mind of our friend, I will first strike at what I call his radical error. He supposes that "Mr. Campbell appears obviously to mean by the term *state* what the old Divines used to call a *relative* change, in contradistinction to what they called a *real* change." Now if I may be allowed to explain myself, I must say that I mean a *real* change; and let me add, there is no writer of any note, among either the old or new Divines known to me, that ever contrasted *relative* with *real*. *Outward*

and *inward* are proper contrasts, but *relative* and *real* are not. But I may, perhaps, become still more bold and affirm that *there is no change more real than a relative change.* My friend will tell me this is an assumption. So my using any word in the English language according to its proper meaning is an assumption, on his premises. Of such assumptions I will always be guilty; and I submit it to all persons of discernment, whether there can be any thing said or written intelligibly unless we assume that words represent the stipulated ideas which lexicographers have assigned them.

But I must prove that there is no change more real than a relative change. Have enemies become friends, *real* friends? Is not this a real change? And pray what is it but a relative change? They now stand in the relation of friends; formerly in the relation of enemies. But a change, a real change in their minds, words, actions, has taken place; and what is it but in relation to one another? No other change in their feelings, thoughts, words, and actions, but in relation to one another, has taken place; consequently it is a relative change. Their powers, physical, mental, moral; their faculties of understanding, their passions and affections, are the same as before; but not in relation to one another. The change is wholly *relative*, and yet no change is more *real*. I hope I shall be excused from multiplying comments or proofs upon a point which all must see. Has a woman really changed her state by entering into the bonds of matrimony? Has a citizen really changed his political relations, his country, or his government? Has a person really changed from debtor to creditor, from enmity to love, from serving the devil to serving the Lord? All these are real changes, and they are all *relative*. It will be relieving the mind of Andrew to correct him on this one point, for I see him entangled in the meshes of this net, curiously wrought from his Alpha to his Omega.

But a more subtle *sophisma termini*, a more subtle mistake of the import of the term *state* has greatly bewildered him. He regards the term *state* as only meaning *outward relation*, as not at all expressive of any thing inward or *spiritual*. "Justified, pardoned, adopted, express (he says) a state merely relative"—but sanctified, reconciled, and saved, represent "*characters*," "intrinsic quality;" and the word "holiness" represents "a principle possessed;" and the actions flowing from that principle called holiness, are "called holy actions"—"reconciliation is with Mr. C. one of the outside things;" yet in the next breath he says, "our author does not distinguish between the *internal* and the *external*." And why does my friend distinguish for me, and tell his readers that with me all is *external*, while he declares I make no such distinctions!! I wish he had saved himself, the reader, and me, the trouble of examining a set of distinctions which I never made, and which no wise man will ever make. All this grows out of the mental confusion superinduced by a too respectful attention to the whole host of "evangelical writers from the era of the Reformation." A person of my friend's usual perspicuity could not have been so completely confounded with unmeaning distinctions, had he acted more

independently, and paid less regard to evangelical writers nursed and cherished in the bosom of Popery.

But to set this matter in its true light, and to define words which I thought unnecessary to define in the Extra, No. 1, not supposing then that even the obliquities of system could so far bewilder any person on the words *state* and *character* as is now apparent in the pamphlet before me, I will now approach the root of this confusion.

State, in the religious acceptation, means *relation*. It applies to men and things in all the attitudes in which they can stand to one another. If we classify human relations into natural, political, and moral, then we classify the states into natural, political, and moral. There are, then, natural, political, and moral states. Hence, among all writers and speakers it is applied to things mental, physical, moral, religious. Nothing more common than the phrase, state of mind, state of health, state of religion, state of morals, state of slavery, &c.

Every state in which man exists permits him, and, indeed, requires him, to form the character and to cultivate the qualities which comport with that state. Hence we have character, good, bad, and indifferent, applied to magistrates and subjects, masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, &c. &c. The standard of perfection in character is conformity to the nature of the state. He that acts conformably to the state or relation of a son is a good son, and he that does not is a bad son; and so of all the others.

Now the terms pardoned, justified, adopted, sanctified, reconciled, and saved, represent states or relations. They apply to *persons* as moral or rational agents. They are sometimes, also, figuratively applied to things. Thus we are said to adopt an argument, to justify an action, to sanctify a day, to reconcile an assertion, to save the crop, &c. But when applied to persons they represent states, natural, political and moral. But in relation to God they represent religious states only. In this sense did we use them. Hence they all represent *spiritual relations*. The relation in which my soul stands to God, who is a spirit, must of necessity be a spiritual relation: for standing before him the moral governor as a moral agent, I stand in a moral relation. To call these "outward or external relations" is at variance with fact and the proper use of words. But we shall relieve the reader by letting him hear our friend speak a paragraph from page 9 on these terms—

"That the terms *pardoned, justified, adopted,* express a state merely relative, is readily admitted. They represent something done *for* us, not *in* us. They are expressive of extrinsic acts in our favor, which, in their nature, do not affect the qualities or exercises of the mind, though in their tendency and effect they may do so. Thus, a criminal may be *pardoned;* a man wrongfully accused may be *justified,* a stranger may be *adopted;* while, in each case, the subject may remain, as to personal character, the same; for these acts produce only *relative* change, or what Mr. C. calls a change of *state*. But the case appears materially different with regard to the other terms, *sanctified, reconciled, saved.*"

How arbitrary this dividing of six terms into twice three, and giving to the first three and to the last three different meanings! The first

three represent only a state; but the last, having a *double meaning*, represent both *relation* and *character!* How suitable to the theory! How happy it is that three words should be chosen in the first case which have but one meaning, and three in the second case which have double meanings, applicable to both state and character!

The first three represent some things done *for* us, not *in* us; but the last three represent something done *in* us! In the old King's version I think I was wont to read of six things done for us: "Sanctify them through thy truth;" "he saved us;" "he hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." These are the last three; and my friend A. B. remembers the first three things done *for* us. But it only *appears* to him that *sanctified*, *reconciled*, and *saved* represent qualities and characters. I confess this whole disquisition is one of the newest pieces of criticism I have met with.

To *sanctify* is to separate to God, whether it be body, soul, or spirit. This all critics, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, will, and do affirm. It is applied in both Testaments to persons, places, things, animate and inanimate, and always means the same thing.

God is said to sanctify *persons*. He sanctified Jesus, who was holy in the vulgar sense. "Say you of him whom the Father has sanctified," said Jesus. He has sanctified all the brotherhood. "But you are washed, justified, sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God." "Our *food* is sanctified by the word of God and prayer," &c. God is sanctified in the hearts of the saints: "Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." When we separate any thing religiously, we are said to sanctify it; and when God sanctifies any thing to himself, he separates it. God is called *the most holy*, because he is infinitely separated from all impurity. Christians are as instantaneously sanctified as they are justified, adopted, or reconciled. They are sanctified when their whole person, body, soul, and spirit are separated to God. It is like proving that *red* represents a color, to prove that sanctification means separation to God.

My friend Andrew relies upon such phrases as, "I am less than the least of all saints," "he comes with his saints;" to prove that *saint* represents qualities, or attributes of character; but as rationally might he adduce "I am the least of all the children—He comes with all his children," to prove that the word *child* represents not a state, but a quality or attribute of character.

There is, let me observe, a character suitable to every state, and qualities compose this character. He that is in a justified state should, and will do justly, act righteously, and establish the character of a righteous man. He that is sanctified, or called a *saint*, will follow holiness, purity, and will act "as becometh saints," or sanctified persons. He that is adopted into the family of God will cultivate filial dispositions, and aspire after the dignity of a son of God.

SECOND CAPITAL ERROR.

Having dwelt so long on this first of my friend Andrew's mistakes, or misapprehensions, and before finishing my remarks on these

terms, I proceed to notice his second great error, or mistake, which has perverted all his reasonings upon this most important topic. It will be found pretty strongly expressed in page 7, already quoted, in the following terms: "There is an act [meaning an *external* or *bodily act*] by which the state of a person thus condemned is changed, and that this act is baptism or christian immersion." His views of baptism as *a mere external* or *bodily act*, have exerted a very injurious influence upon his understanding. And is it possible that one of our most able and experienced Baptist preachers contemplates baptism in no other light than as a "*mere outward bodily act!*" No wonder, then, that he ascribes to it so little importance in the christian economy. *Bodily exercise profiteth little*, says Paul. Now we had been accustomed to consider christian immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in water, as one of the most singular of all institutions ever ordained on earth because of many peculiarities, but on account of none more than this, that it was an act of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit. The soul of the intelligent subject is as fully immersed *into the Lord Jesus*, as his body is immersed *in the water*. His soul rises with the Lord Jesus, as his body rises out of the water; and into one spirit with all the family of God is he immersed. It is not like circumcising a Hebrew infant, or proselyting to Moses a Gentile adult. The candidate believing in the person, mission, and character of the Son of God, and willing to submit to him immediately, upon recognizing him, hastens to be buried with the Lord, and to rise with him, not corporeally, but spiritually with his whole soul.

My friend Andrew Brooddus, with all his *Baptist* brethren, has been contending with the *Paidos* for many years about nothing but a *mere external bodily act!* In what a ridiculous plight does this ultraism of Andrew Broaddus place his sect and himself before the universe! Breaking communion with nine-tenths of the justified, pardoned, reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and saved, for, or on account of a mere external bodily act!!!

If I dare counsel him and my friends Semple, Kerr, Brantly, and Clopton, I would advise them to go to Mr. Converse, the organ of the Presbyterians in Richmond, and say, "Brother Converse, you, with all *believing* Paidobaptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Quakers, are justified, pardoned, reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and saved; and we have been refusing fellowship with you all our lives, and contending about "a mere outward bodily act;" but we see our error, ask your pardon, surrender our arms and munitions of war, and will promise never again to contend with you about such superstitious usages as "mere external, outward, bodily immersion" in rivers, ponds, or baths. We have spent too much ink, paper, and breath already about a mere bodily act; but hereafter we will only plead for the *essentials*. Come, brother Converse, help us against these watery bigots. We care as little for water as yourself." This is, indeed, virtually doing in all quarters of the land; and by none more than by the author of the pamphlet before me. He deserves the thanks of more than Mr. Brantly.

Put these two errors side by side in the mind of any man; and can he say more for the truth than my friend has done in his pamphlet? He represents me as regarding pardoned, justified, sanctified, &c. as terms representing only an *outward* relation, expressive of no moral change, but mere extrinsic relation; and as agreeing with him that immersion is a mere outward bodily act. No room for the heart in such a scheme! What phantoms may arise to the eyes of him who believes in ghosts and apparitions, "tall and ghastly, that walk at dead of night, or take their stand o'er some new-made grave; and, strange to tell, vanish at the crowing of the cock!"

But there is yet a graver point of view in which to consider this representation of that most sacred and significant of divine institutions, which is but once to be submitted to in the whole life of man. Indeed, on more mature reflection upon this stigma, this reproach upon the christian institution—*immersion, a mere outward bodily act*—I scarcely know how to repress my feelings. What! a christian minister to adopt the language of those who scoff at all religion! "What," says Voltaire, "a pretty fable, to damn to degradation in time, and to ruin in eternity, a whole race, with a few exceptions, for the mere outward bodily act of eating an apple! What venom in the teeth of Eve! What malignity in the bite of Adam! A whole race is lost for the sake of an apple! This is another Pandora's box! Angels were hurled to Tartarus for looking at themselves; and men are damned because a woman put her hand to her mouth!!" But the good intention of my friend Andrew comes in to extenuate this offence; and well for us that we are not under a government where a rash bodily act, like that of Uzzah, though dictated by the best intentions, must be avenged with the loss of life. But, reader, be admonished how you speak of bodily acts in obedience to divine institutions. Remember Eve, Adam, and all transgressors on the one hand. Remember Abel, Noah, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, down to the harlot Rahab on the other; and be cautious how you speak of bodily acts! Rather remember the sacrifice of a body on Mount Calvary, and talk not lightly of bodily acts. There is no such thing as outward bodily acts in the christian institution; and less than in all others, in the act of immersion. Then it is that the spirit, soul, and body of man become one with the Lord. Then it is that the power of the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit come upon us. Then it is that we are enrolled among the children of God, and enter the ark which will, if we abide in it, transport us to the Mount of God.

THIRD CAPITAL ERROR.

A third error, of great magnitude, intimately allied to these two, and which runs through the whole system of my friend Andrew, and which I must also notice before I finish my strictures on the two preceding, is, his representing faith at one time as an essence or principle, and at another confounding it with its acts or fruits.

My friend Andrew is occasionally enamored with, and speaks in glowing terms of faith by itself, without any act whatever: of pure

unmixed faith—a mere principle of action, working all the wonders of pardon, justification, adoption, &c.

I am not metaphysician enough, nor have I got a pair of hair balances of such metaphysical correctness, and standard weights, to ascertain the gravity and value of sheer faith, stark naked faith, without body, parts, or substance; a principle of such ethereal purity as to have neither passion, action, nor affection in its nature, wrought into the heart too, without human or angelic hands, as the infusion of life from the breath of God into the red earth which constituted the body of Adam. I know this refined and pure abstract principle, yclep'd faith, is said to work by love; but the work of love is not the principle, but the operation, whether mental, moral, or physical, which flows from it. This pure faith is a pure metaphysical essence, fabricated by metaphysical machinery and curiously wrought into the heart without the interposition of eyes, ears, or hands; and yet it changes a man's relations towards the whole universe the instant it is created in the mind, before it has operated to will or to do!! This is the scholastic view of the matter, of the justifying, pardoning, sanctifying, adopting, reconciling, and saving essence or effluence of an essence increate.

Reader, understandest thou this? If thou dost, thou canst shake hands with angels and handle spirits with exquisite sensibility. Now we vulgar, terrene, and earthly beings, who soar not on winged horses beyond the eagle's eye, cannot conceive of this impalpable, imperceptible essence; but faith with us is *the belief of testimony* apprehended and understood: and this testimony when apprehended induces us to receive the Lord Jesus as our Prophet, Priest, and King: for he is the object testified, and this testimony believed puts our souls in motion towards him; for the first motions of this truth believed are towards Jesus, into whose embrace we rush with all impetuosity so soon as we know where to find him. The consummation of the first motions of our souls is in our immersion into his death. Before immersion the soul has not found rest in him.

A child opens its eyes and beholds its long absent mother. The instant it sees her, its whole person, soul, body, and spirit, is put in motion. It rises, walks, runs into her embrace. Its greetings, salutations, caresses await the encircling of her arms, and are never consummated till it lays its head upon her bosom. Thus with me stand faith and immersion. A sinner opens his eyes, and the light of the Sun of Righteousness fills them. He sees [or believes in] Jesus. This sight [belief] puts his spirit in motion. He hears his promises, rises, walks, runs to embrace him. He apprehends that he has been pleased to make the assignation, the meeting place, where he has first recorded his name. *Into* the name of the Lord he rushes; goes with him first into his grave, lies down with him in the mansion of the dead, rises with him, and follows in his affections his ascension into heaven. How morally beautiful are the espousals of a sinner to Jesus! O Lord! remove the veil from the eyes of those who read the New Testament!

And Mr. Brantly calls this the *pernicious* doctrine of A. Campbell!! Lord, anoint his eyes with the true eye salve that he may see! And O that Andrew may become more like Simon Peter's brother!!

But although Andrew would seem to make the essence or the principle of faith infused, the justification and sanctification of a sinner, he appears unwilling to rely upon it in his argument, and in practice he goes for all that he opposes: I say, *in practice* he will have a sinner justified by the acts of faith; and in argument, too, he virtually—yea, formally, goes for the act of faith as that which justifies. Of this I shall now attempt to convict himself and convince the reader. Reader, I feel no concern in convicting him, nor in convincing you, that in this pamphlet he establishes the principles which he labors to oppose for the mere purpose of fastening an inconsistency upon him, but for the sake of showing that in his own mind there is a lurking suspicion of his own reasoning, and frequently an open avowal of principles subversive of all his reasonings. It cannot be otherwise. Truth alone is consistent all through.

Now let me only premise before introducing his definitions of justifying faith, that faith is faith, that love is love, and that hope is hope. In other words, faith is not its acts; the grape is not the vine; nor the apple the tree. If we confound pity and alms, faith and love, faith and embracing, faith and its exercise, there is an end to all reasoning, thinking, or speaking correctly upon the subject. Either a man is justified by stark naked faith alone, or he is justified by faith with its concomitants, adjuncts, or acts. One of these is true; the other is false. They are two propositions *toto cælo* distinct. He that affirms that God approbates the person who simply pities the poor, affirms one proposition; and he that affirms that God approbates the man who not merely pities, but performs the bodily act of giving alms, affirms another proposition. They are not the same. He that is justified by faith, and he that is justified by the exercise of faith, are justified upon different principles. Now the latter appears to be the view of my friend Andrew. I shall permit him to speak for himself:—

"God has inseparably connected a state of favor and acceptance with *a holy change* of heart, or *the exercise* of that faith which works by love." p. 15. The exercise of my eye is not my eye; the exercise of my tongue is not my tongue; the exercise of faith is not faith And is it possible we are agreed after all!!

In the same page he affirms, "There is an inseparable connexion between the exercise of such faith and a state of favor and acceptance with God." To this I cordially assent. Only let *the exercise* of faith be according to the commandment. But, reader, observe *the exercise* of faith—the act of faith. What differs *exercise of faith* from *act of faith?* That is just, in this instance, the whole difference between Andrew and Alexander. And yet the former is orthodox, and the latter heterodox!

But, reader, that you may have yet fuller evidence, I quote his great position which he opposes to the capital one in the Extra, page 16;—

"In substance our position is this: That where the heart is changed to love the Saviour, or where the faith exists that works by love—there a change of state does ensue: in other words, that there is an inseparable connexion between the exercise of living faith, and a state of acceptance with God."

Here are *three* efforts to exclude naked faith: 1st. "Where the heart is changed to love the Saviour." A curious definition of faith! 2d. "Where the faith exists which works by love." This is nearer what would suit his theory; but this is a new definition of faith. This is a combining of a scripture phrase with a human distinction. There is no faith thus defined in the New Testament. "Faith works by love;" but he that prefixes the article *the*, adds to God's word, and makes a new faith in contrast with one that works by some other principle or does not work at all; which is not found in the connexion where this phrase occurs. But he not only precedes this clause with an explanatory definition, but follows it up with his finishing developement. 3d. "There is an inseparable connexion between the *exercise* of *living* faith and a state of acceptance with God." Agreed again!! Yes, reader, Andrew and Alexander are one in this great matter. Show me the *exercise* of living faith, and I will show you *something done;* show me a *living* faith, and I will show you a *motion* of faith; for life without motion belongs not to our globe. The controversy now is not about naked faith, but *the exercise of faith*—about *the motions* of a living faith.

In passing along I may remark here, that the above proposition is the only one which Andrew attempts to prove by scripture testimony, as directly contravening the whole scope of the Extra. In proof of it he quotes John v. 24. vi. 47. Acts xiii. 39. Romans v. 1. 1 John, iv. 7. not one of which applies to his definition, as the reader may see by comparing them with the words of the proposition. Not one of these texts speaks of *the exercise* of a living faith; not one of them mentions *a change of heart*, or an *inseparable connexion* between the exercise or the principle of faith, and a state of acceptance. The connexion was in the mind of Andrew, not in the words quoted. But I am not about to examine every period and to detect every sophism in 56 pages. This would require an octavo of 300 pages. I strike at the two or three pillars; and these demolished, each reader may make his own use of the ruins.

To return. I might quote many sayings in the pamphlet to show that the *exercise* of faith is always in the mind of my examiner, and that while he admits that *faith is the belief* of the truth, he discards this in the article of pardon of sin, and substitutes for it the *exercise* of faith.

In page 37 he makes his meaning plain: "But though I do not deny that *a belief of the truth* may properly be said to be faith," [for so the Holy Spirit defines it,] "yet according to the New Testament use of that term," [rather he should heve said my use of that term,] "evangelical faith" [what liberty men will take with God's word!] Evangelical faith! Why not *angelical* faith? "evangelical faith is *such* a belief as *involves*" [yes, involves!] "or takes with it a receiving of the truth in

the love of it." But "it takes *with* it" implies that this is not *of it* If my hand receives or takes with it my cane, it will not follow that my cane is a part of my hand! But let us hear him out and his proof: "And when justification, when salvation is promised to faith, or a belief of the gospel, belief in these connexions," [but not in other connexions!!!] as Mr. Fuller says, is not to be understood exclusive of receiving the Saviour, coming to him, or trusting in him, but as supposing or including these exercises." Both the Andrews (Broaddus and Fuller) and Alexander are one again!! Strange, indeed!! What somersets! The faith that justifies includes these *exercises*—"trusting in," "coming to," and "receiving the Saviour." This is all my ground. "To as many as *received* him to them gave he power to become the sons of God"—which were born of God; and that, as defined by the Great Teacher, is to be "born of water and the Spirit." *Faith, even if it be the belief of the gospel, will not obtain remission of sins, or justify a person, unless it includes three acts or exercises—trusting in Christ, coming to him, and receiving him. Three acts.* Well, agreed again. "*As many of you as have been immersed into Christ have put him on.*" This is Paul's union of three acts. I will go for Paul's one as including these three. But rather than treat the two Andrews as heathen men and publicans, I will go with them and affirm that faith must have, or *include*, or take *with* it, *three exercises* before it justifies a sinner!! And have the mountains again brought forth a mouse? What a smoke! What a noise! What a confusion of figures for nothing!

My *brother* Andrew, (for it appears if unity of opinion constitutes brethren, we are, after all, brethren,)—my brother Andrew gives me great credit for "tact, ingenuity, and fertility of mind." Would that I deserved them! But, really, I must return him the loan with usury. He has exhibited no little of the *three* [what charms in the number *three!*] in writing 56 pages of *examinations* and cross [enough] examinations, while in heart we are one all the while.

Happy to find myself with the two Andrews, each kindly sustaining an arm, the one on my right and the other on the left, I will now let Andrew Broaddus tell the whole story over again by quoting a part of three pages.—p. 45, 46, 47.—

I do not like the meagre quotations which my friend has given in his "Extra Examined." He seems afraid, on sundry occasions, to let me be fully heard. I think we owe the same politeness to an author in reviewing him, we do to a gentleman in conversing with him. We ought to let him do justice to himself—to permit him to explain himself. The only retaliation which I shall inflict upon my friend Andrew in this case will be to give him a larger space. He shall have full measures.

"But what is that faith which performs these wonders;—which is necessary to salvation;—which entitles the subject to the privilege of baptism, and renders it a *duty* incumbent on him, as an avowed subject of the King of Zion? Something has been said on this point, in a former part of this work; but the importance of the matter may render it expedient that we pay to it some further attention. With a few remarks on this subject, we shall draw to a close: and I shall trust to the reader's indulgence, if, in substance, I repeat some of the

ideas which were before advanced. What, then, is the faith of which we speak? Is it merely the assent of the mind, upon historic testimony, to the fact that Jesus of Nazareth lived, and died, and rose again; and gave evidence that he was the Son of God and the true Messiah? No: for while experience testifies that we have really assented to all this, while destitute of the exercises and fruits of true religion; the Scripture gives evidence that persons may believe on Christ, who have not that genuine faith which is connected with salvation. John xii. 42, 43. "Among the chief rulers many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the Synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Again: is such an assent to be considered genuine saving faith, even when accompanied by an external course of morality, and an orderly, religious deportment) I answer, No: unless there be no regard due to the state of the heart, in the sight of God, and to the principles whence our actions flow.

"The question then recurs, In what consists that faith, the object of our inquiry? We shall not encumber this question with the lumber of the schools, nor with the metaphysics of "mystic Doctors." Simply, then, I would say, this evangelic faith consists in a hearty belief of the gospel method of salvation—involving a cordial reception of Christ, and an unreserved dependence on him as the appointed Saviour. See Romans x. 10. John i. 12. 2 Tim. i. 12. This faith, however, is accompanied by certain exercises of mind, which, in the nature of the case, are necessary to its existence. We cannot perceive the fitness and glory of Christ's character as the Saviour, without a conviction of our own sinful and needy condition. We cannot cordially receive the Saviour without repentance and abhorrence of sin; nor shall we ever trust in him until we renounce all vain dependence. Hence the necessity of these exercises of mind, as inculcated in the Scriptures; exercises (I may add) which are witnessed by the *experience* of every vital christian.

"Such is the faith which we consider requisite to acceptance with God,—such "the things which accompany salvation." But as to the *manner* in which these exercises are effected; whether rapidly or more gradually; whether by impressions of a more powerful or more gentle character; these are *circumstances* which we think do not affect the *essence* of the matter. Confident we are, that some who are the subjects of these exercises, are waiting, through a mistaken calculation, for some marvellous display of power which they have never experienced; when they ought to arise and obey the Saviour, and thus find their strength increased. And confident we are, that too many, who have not this faith and these exercises, though they assent to the facts of the gospel, and feel, in some measure, the awful force of divine truth,—are presumptuously delaying the concerns of their salvation, while they endeavor to persuade themselves that they are waiting for divine influence. No! they are not waiting for divine influence, but resisting that force of truth which they already feel. Reader, if thou art one of this description, remember there is enough of divine influence already for thy condemnation. Awake and repent!"

This is better, far better still. Thrice happy am I now in the parting scene. This is the close of the review of the Extra. What a closing scene!

Mark you, reader, I answer NO, *examino*, to all the questions which he thus answers. There is a great improvement here in his finishing touch, in the last tint given to faith. It consists in a hearty belief of *the gospel method of salvation*, faith, repentance, immersion, remission, the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, and eternal life through the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. It is not faith simplex, but that faith which justifies, which regards *the whole gospel method of salvation*—"involving a cordial reception of Christ and an unreserved dependence on him as the appointed Saviour." This goes the whole. If

any controversy remains, and yet there remains a little, it is upon such sayings as the following, which just succeed the above quotation:—

"Bow down and pray. Arise and believe! Though not possessed of *saving* faith, you have a measure of *incipient* faith; and God can give you to believe effectually. Though not a penitent at the feet of Jesus, as you ought to be, divine grace can bring you there. And though, at present, not "pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, nor saved"—these rainbow colors shall be stampt by the Sun of Righteousness on the darkness of a beclouded soul—the earnest of eternal sunshine in the presence of God. *Then* we would say, "Arise and be baptized;" and in the liquid, *emblematic* grave of Jesus, "wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.' Live to his glory, die in his favor, and be happy with him for ever."

This reminds me of Jacob's *blessing* pronounced on Issachar. Gen xlix. 14, 15. I do not like to quote it. There is something curious in it about "couching down between two burdens." "*Bow down and pray.*" "*Arise and believe.*" This is staggering between two burdens. Another effort, and we have him upon his feet! Alas! for "*incipient* faith"!!! "Though not a penitent." Worse still! But it will not do to end with "*Bow down and pray,*" nor with "*Arise and believe.*" But let him have breath, he will speak out just now. Here it comes: "*Arise and be baptized,* and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." How are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished!!!

While we express an essential agreement with the two Andrews on the premises before the reader, it is not to be understood that we approve their definitions because of their biblical, logical, or grammatical accuracy; but because when they come to explain themselves upon what they mean to include in that faith, to which they say salvation from the guilt, pollution, power, and punishment of sin is annexed, with which a change of all relations towards God and the moral universe is connected, they include in it, or add to it, such acts and exercises of the understanning and heart as subvert all their reasonings against the obedience of faith; and establish such premises for us as enable us to demonstrate that the only difference is about the *quantity*, or extent, or meaning of these acts and exercises of faith.

We choose to say with James that *faith is not perfected* until it works according to the command. *Perfect* faith justifies; but *imperfect* faith does not. "By works was the faith of Abraham made *perfect.*" *Telio*, the word here used, is from *telios*, a perfect man; a word *always* used by the Greeks to contradistinguish a man of mature age from a strippling. James ii. 22. "*Kai ex ton ergon he pistis etiliothe*"—by works was his faith perfected. No man's faith is perfected, according to the christian institution, until he puts on Christ according to the commandment, "*Arise and be immersed,*" or "Be immersed for remission." Andrew's "*incipient faith*" is not enough, himself being judge. Let him, then, teach the people to consummate or perfect their faith by obedience.* But let him remember that the princi-

* We think it unnecessary to repeat a dissertation upon faith and justification already before our reader. Our friend Andrew will consider what is written in this volume, page 266, as a part of our reply to him.

ple or feeling called *pity*, is not the *alms* which it bestows. Alms, however, is efficient pity—perfect pity. Neither is faith and love, nor any exercise of faith, one and the same thing with faith. Faith must be contradistinguished from repentance, reformation, baptism, and every act which it works out. But "as the body without the spirit is dead, so *faith alone*, or without works, is dead."

Having now shown the wanderings and labyrinths into which my friend Andrew has conducted himself and his reader upon immersion, viewed as *an outward bodily act*, (a phrase which occurs in almost every page of his pamphlet,) upon the subject of *state* and a change of state, as an *outward relation*, as not a *real*, because a *relative* change; and upon *faith* as including such acts or exercises as are equivalent to all that for which we contend, we have, we think, really and fully reviewed his "*Extra Examined;*" and we leave it to the reader himself to say, whether we have not thoroughly refuted his theory, so far as it stands opposed to the meaning of the *Extra*. But to close our remarks upon these three palpable errors, as we conceive them, we submit the following remarks upon the whole premises now before the reader:—

1. There are no acts of worship, or of religion, ordained by Jesus Christ, that are at all to be regarded as *outward* or *external bodily acts*. "God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." *Vocal* prayer and praise, though they are exercises of the larynx, the tongue, and the lips; the bending of the knee, or the standing erect, or falling upon the ground; the eating of bread, the drinking of wine, or any other exertion of one, or more, or all of our organs, mental or corporeal, are not to be regarded as acts of religion except they are exercises of the understanding and the heart; and no man of any sense ever pleads for these as bodily acts as of any importance whatever.

2. But the spirit of man cannot act at all without the body; it cannot think, if the brain be not exercised; it cannot speak, unless the tongue be moved; it cannot feel, but by the nerves; it cannot move, but by the organs of the body. How unreasonable, then, to separate, or to regard human action in reference to the particular organ which operates. Immersion is as *spiritual* an act, when proceeding from faith in God's promises, as any act in which a person is either active or passive. FAITH IS AS MUCH A BODILY ACT AS IMMERSION. No man, without the exercise of his senses, can believe any thing. "Faith comes by *hearing*," says a Master in Israel.

I doubt not but my friend Andrew will both perceive and *feel* this to be as true as the gospel. And I need not tell him in what an attitude these two remarks place all his reasonings in this pamphlet.

3. A change of state is never outward in the christian religion. I know of no such thing. In a political religion it may, *perhaps*, be so; but never in relation to God through Jesus Christ. God reconciles, pardons, justifies, sanctifies, adopts, and saves sinners through Jesus Christ. Not one of these in the christian economy exists alone Andrew, on page 12, attacks this position. Reader, hear him:—

"Strike away *one* of these links, then, and Mr. C's chain is broken: attach *one* of these privileges or blessings to the unbaptized believer, and his argument is gone. Allowing, then, for instance, (what we really think ought now to be allowed) that a penitent believer is reconciled to God—he stands, of course, in all the other favored relations, and so none of these privileges depend for their existence on the act of immersion. Aware of consequences, our author is not for allowing that any one of these privileges belongs to a believer *as such;* and so *the believer,* as far as we can see, is in just as bad a state as *the unbeliever, only* that he is prepared by faith for the all-prevailing influence of baptism."

This, I suppose, he calls *reasoning* and *proof!!* A penitent believer reconciled without the remission of his sins! What an idea! A guilty soul will as soon love God perfectly as any penitent be reconciled without the tender of pardon. I can conceive a case illustrative of the reconciliation which may precede the actual enjoyment of pardon; but yet pardon is secured even in this case before reconciliation. Simon was convicted and condemned to be beheaded for the murder of Edwin. A mediator interposes, and the governor promises pardon on condition that Simon will sign a certain covenant. The proclamation is tendered to him by a minister of law. He rejoices and is reconciled even before he signs the covenant. But mark you, reader, it is because he is resolved to sign, and because he considers the pardon as secured upon his signing. Until he has written his name in full he is not actually pardoned; but from the moment he believes the messages he rejoices, because he is determined to obey the requisition. This is not an analogy in the case: for the parties at variance are not Simon and the governor, but it represents how a man may rejoice in any blessing, and be reconciled to any person *prospectively,* because he is secured of the blessing sought, by having it put within his power.

But no sinner has been reconciled to God but by having pardon put within his own power. Nor can he be justified until he receives pardon. Reconciliation is as intimately connected with pardon and the other blessings as thinking is with the healthy exercise of the brain.

When I turn my face to the Sun at high noon, I look to the South; the East is on my left hand, the West on my right, and the North is behind me. In these four attitudes to the cardinal points I stand. If I place myself in any one of these attitudes I stand at the same instant in all the others. I cannot face the South but I stand in these positions to all the cardinal points. No matter which I seek first, second, or third: so soon as I have the East on my left hand I stand in all these attitudes. This is an illustration drawn from local position. It illustrates moral relations in the sense before my mind. When I am justified, all the others follow. When I am reconciled, all the others follow. No matter which I seek or place first. But these are moral relations. Hence they are all found in Christ—not out of him. He is my sun and my shield. In him I have light and safety. My soul, bless thou the Lord! "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and in him shall they glory."

Talk not about *internal* putting on. "As many as have been baptized into Christ have put him on." We put him on our whole person, we clothe ourselves with him. It is not mental, nor corporeal—it is *personal*. We give him the head, the heart, and the hand. The Lord separates to himself our body, soul, and spirit. May the Lord preserve them unblamed until he comes in all the glory of his Father!

4. Relative changes are the only *real* changes we know any thing of. I never saw any thing changed but relatively. Are birth, marriage, death *real* changes? They are all *relative*. When a change relates to matter, it is *corporeal;* when to God, it is *spiritual*, moral.

5. Qualities belong both to states and characters; but there are no degrees in the former: there are in the latter. Matrimony is called a holy state. Adultery is a state, too; but it is an unholy state. A person is as perfectly married after the vow is made according to law, as when he has been a husband forty years. He is perfectly sanctified in state when he enters into the new institution. But there are many degrees in the holy qualities which adorn the heart and life. Yet holiness applies to character, and qualities as it does to state; only with this difference that the state is perfect at once, but the character admits of many degrees. "Be holy as I am holy," says the Lord. It means the same, however, whether applied to state or character; *i. e.* a separation from all and every thing common, unclean, or impure. "Let no *unclean* communication proceed out of your mouth." "Lay aside all filthiness of flesh and spirit, and perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord." "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

6. The Lord's plan of reforming men is very different from all human plans. They attempt to change and improve a man's state by reforming his character; but God reforms the character by changing the state. "*Your sins are forgiven you: go and sin no more.*" This single sentence speaks a volume.

All the changes of the natural world are the consequences of the change of position. The attitude in which the Earth stands to the Sun in every part of its orbit, is the cause of all the changes in the animal and vegetable kingdoms of nature.

Gentle Spring, with all its ethereal mildness, unbinding the earth, waking to life, music, and melody, now clothing the fields with vivid verdure, and the juicy groves with buds and flowers; refulgent Summer with its full-blown beauties, its flowery leaves covered with tribes of evanescent insects, which mock the calculating eye; golden Autumn, with all its teeming harvests of fruits and grain; and stern Winter, with all its clouds, its storms, and tempests, owe their existence and influences to state, or the Earth's relation to the Sun. So stand we in the moral universe to the great moral centre, the Sun of Mercy which has arisen upon a dark and frozen world. To produce all these countless and wonderful changes in our globe, the Creator has nought to do, but to place it in new attitudes to the Sun. So by an act of grace, by moral attraction, he changes our state to the Sun of Mercy,

and in this new relation we are clothed with moral beauty and excellency, and filled with joy and melody.

Not yet is the analogy carried out. Motives in the moral world resemble momentum, gravity, or attraction in the natural. On minds arguments, which are motives, operate as attraction upon matter. Attraction presents the earth in all her 365 attitudes to the Sun, and is that which changes her position. Arguments of love and pity falling in the rays of the Sun of Mercy upon the mind of man, turn the heart to the Sun of Righteousness, or changes our relation to him, and from moral position or relation come all the fruits and flowers, all the fragrance and beauty which adorn and bless human character. But I shall forget that this is a piece of "polemic theology;" and that not analogies or illustrations, but arguments triangular, acute, and pointed, are expected. Be it so; but let us look up and around us, and admire the fair temple of the universe, where nature, grace, and glory stand to each other as the outer court, the holy place, and the most holy.

Here I open the Larger Catechism, on which I hummed and hemmed some thirty years ago. And what does it say?—"Justification is an act of God's free grace"—"Adoption is an act of God's free grace"—"Sanctification is a work of God's free grace"—"Effectual calling is the work of God's almighty power and grace"—"Justifying faith is a saving grace," and "Repentance unto life is a saving grace." Ah me, in what bold relief does my friend Andrew appear in all that is said in this good old system.

7. All these terms, expressive of states, have respect to the present salvation, and not to that which is to be revealed when the Lord comes. Reconciliation, pardon, justification, sanctification, adoption, and salvation from the guilt, power and pollution of sin, are not parts of the future salvation of the body, or the new creation which will be the result of the resurrection unto eternal life. This is a salvation which belongs to the kingdom of grace. My friend Andrew does not discern this reign of God as contradistinguished from the kingdom of glory; at least so I think from the piece before me, for he will have all sent to ultimate perdition who are not justified, sanctified, adopted, &c. in this present life. Hence the frequency of the repetition of this obnoxious sentiment in the 56 pages. It serves admirably to awaken not only the *odium theologicum*, but all the *charitable* laity, who have got Abraham, Mahomet, and Caiaphas, together with all the Popes and Prelates of many centuries, now sitting side by side in heaven. My friend is "right good" at stirring up these religious charities against him who says "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved," and contends that this is just what Jesus Christ meant.

I think in a population, the majority of which was deistical, I could make myself very popular by the use of such tools. Let me see—I would go to work in this way:—Christianity is too contracted for the exigencies of men; it is not of that sublime and comprehensive compass which, like deism, takes in all climes and all ages. How few scores of the human race are benefitted by Jesus Christ and the gos-

pel in comparison of the myriads of millions which are, if it be true, "stamped with the black seal of condemnation"! There are too many preachers, rags, ink, and presses necessary to its plans and operations. How few can read, and how few can hear the gospel! and of these few how many are governed by it! And what virtue is in its institutions? Some talk of prayer, and of repentance, and of baptism, and of being baptized in fire! Now what is prayer but words? and what are words but *wind?* and what is repentance but sorrow and grief? and what is baptism but water or fire? What can wind, water, fire, or groans do to save the soul of man forever? How much more rational it is to put eternal life beyond the reach of the possibility of such accidents! I ask for neither words, signs, sacraments, water, fire, books, or preachers. The light within; this is the common grace, the true grace, the universal grace. I will not mark every wretch to perdition who cannot read or find a preacher. Nor will I rest a man's eternal doom upon either-fire, air, earth, or water.—I shall close this digression with a few words, perfectly unique, from my friend Andrew—

"In some cases it must be attended with extreme inconvenience and exposure to obtain the benefit of baptism, immediately on the exercise of faith. But this, according to the view we have been examining, ought to be done, through *all* difficulties. In other cases it is not only *almost*, but *altogether impracticable*. And in this state of things, the person dying, could not, consistently with his case as represented in the "Extra," be admitted into the felicity of the blessed. He must perish; for he is without holiness; and without holiness none can see the Lord."

Hear him again, page 19:—

"The principle without the act (it seems) is *nothing*. Suppose, then, a person to be physically unable to be baptized. What provision does this doctrine make in such a case?—None! It sternly demands, over the head of impossibility itself, the performance of the act. And though this person may have the faith which works by love, it leaves him stampt with the black seal of condemnation for, *the principle without the act is nothing. Credat Judæus Apella!*"

Yes; over the head, ears, and shoulders of impossibility! This is too churlish for thy liberal soul. How kind art thou, my good friend! "Let it be neither mine nor thine, but divide it"! Timothy Dwight, D. D. avers, and we are as uncharitable as he, that he who refuses baptism, understanding it, shall never entnr the visible nor invisible kingdom of God.—vol. 4, p. 302.

I repeat that these things are affirmed of the present salvation. But here I thought it necessary to take up the Extra and read it once over, the first time, too, since it was issued from the office, to see what I had written on this subject. I dare not tell the reader all my convictions and feelings on the re-examination of that pamphlet of 60 pages. With all its imperfections, and like every thing which proceeds from the same head, heart, and hand, it has its imperfection, I feel assured before God that no man, as far as I have seen, has weakened in the least a single fundamental point in that essay. I did not think it was so full, so precise, so well stored with arguments and illustrations, as I now find it is; and moreover, every objection of note which I have now read against it, either in the pamphlet before me, or published from any quarter during 15 months past, is fully met,

and, in my judgment, fully removed in the Extra itself. I am willing to put it into the hands of any man, and my friend Andrew Broaddus' examination of it with it, and leave the result to his own judgment. He has not, in the candid judgment of its author, even shattered a single stone, much less a column in its walls or towers. He has in one or two places knocked a little of the *mortar* out, and *the smoke* of his powder has done infinitely more damage than his *lead*—it has blackened the walls, while his metal lies shattered around them. So much for metaphors. But it is for the impartial to examine this matter for themselves. Fathers, we know, have much affection for their own children.

But my labor in reviewing is much lessened in consequence of this reading; and the candor of my friend Andrew has lost fifty per cent. in my market since I have read his piece the second time, and the Extra a second time, both of which have been done since October commenced. For I never opened his pamphlet from the first glance until two or three days ago. I am astonished to see how much is said by Andrew about little matters, when the great arguments of the Extra are only hinted at, and the very objections he has made, anticipated without his seeming to have noticed it. The four-fifths of the pamphlet before me is refuted on pages 52, 53, and 54 of the Extra. To these we request the attention of the reader.

These remarks are occasioned from my opening the Extra to see what was said on the Kingdom of Grace, and on Regeneration. I had written some pages in reply to Andrew's remarks on these two points, thinking that I was furnishing new matter; but on opening the Extra I found that all this was before said, and that my friend had paid no attention to it. I then resolved not to repeat what he had not considered, and now dismiss this part of my labor with a few periods—

In the Extra, Regeneration is shown to belong to the Kingdom of Grace or the New Reign, sometimes called the Reign of Heaven. No attention is paid to the fact that the *first* time, and indeed the *only time* in which our Lord spoke of being *born again*, was in reference to *his kingdom*. This matter is wholly overlooked by Andrew and all other opponents, and it is a fact of vast importance, as many of the intelligent have felt and acknowledged. The doctrine of infant regeneration with a reference to the future and everlasting kingdom of glory, and all the speculations about infant, Jewish and Pagan, salvation, in which Monks and Anchorites so much delighted, are exploded by the apprehension of this fact and its bearings. But having now more than examined the three capital errors of the pamphlet before me, and having appended such general remarks as we thought necessary to correct other mistakes in the mind of our friend, we shall now pay some attention to Regeneration.

REGENERATION DEFINED.

The first and all-important enquiry with me, in reading the oracles of God, has long been, is now, and, I presume, while I live, will be,

what were the exact ideas that the writers of the New Testament associated with the terms which they used. This ascertained and we cannot err. There is something now called regeneration, and there was something then called regeneration; but are these the same thing? I think they are not. But, reader, here is my most serious complaint against all my opponents, candid and uncandid; while I contend that regeneration in the New Testament acceptation meant simply immersion, they hold me up as ascribing to immersion their ideas of regeneration. Suppose I refuse to call an apple an orange, is it just for any person to represent me as denying the existence of any such thing as an orange, or as ascribing to an apple all the attributes of an orange? This is precisely the trick they practise upon the community. This is the sophism which they employ against my reasoning. While I contend that an apple is not an orange I do not deny that there is an orange, and that it has its proper attributes. I contend that there must be all they call a moral change; that there must be a *renovation* of the human heart to constitute a christian; but I call that "*the renewal of the Holy Spirit*," and not "regeneration:" because, as I will soon show, this is the style of the New Testament. But here let me again state that we regard the true meaning of the words used by the Apostles as the doctrine of Christ, as the true orthodoxy.

I am happy to introduce here the concurrent testimony of one of the most learned Rabbis and most renowned Biblical Critics now living on this continent. Professor Stuart, of the Andover school, in confirmation of this saying—

Mr. Stuart to Doctor Channing.

"The claims of the Bible to be authoritative, being once admitted, the simple question in respect to it is, what does it teach in regard to any particular passage? What idea did the original writer mean to convey? When this is ascertained by the legitimate rules of interpretation, it is authoritative. This is *orthodoxy* in the highest and best sense of the word; and every thing which is opposed to it, which modifies it, which fritters its meaning away, is *heterodoxy*, is *heresy;* to whatever name or party it is attached. After all, it is a principle by which, if I have any knowledge of my own heart, I desire forever to be guided, to "call no man master on earth." I would place the decision of Scripture, fairly made out, *immeasurably above* all human opinions. I regard the one as the decision of an unerring God: the other as the opinions of *fallible* men."

This is with me an oracle of reason, a decision of common sense, against which, we think, no man of sound mind can object. While on the subject of interpretation, I will introduce a few quotations from the standard writers of this age, showing that we have all literary authority for our procedure in ascertaining the meaning of this phrase, and every other on which we rely. The judicious reader is aware that the whole jet and pith of this controversy must be decided by the meaning of John 3 & 5, and Titus 3 & 5. Soon as we ascertain the meaning of these two sayings, the doctrine of the Extra is sustained or refuted. Because if God saves men "by the washing of regeneration *and* the renewal of the Holy Spirit," through his mercy, then we understand the present salvation when we understand these terms which Paul employs to define it. This definition, reader, ex-

hibits the present salvation. But let us first attend to the rules of interpretation.

Melancthon says, "the scriptures cannot be understood *theologically* until it is understood *grammatically*." Luther also avers "that a *certain* knowledge of the sense of scripture depends solely on a knowledge of the words."

Ernesti and Moros, whom I quote together because the latter was a commentator upon the former, and because agreeing on the principles and rules of interpretation, and because the translation of this work by Professor Stuart of Andover is now made *the text book* on the subject of interpretation in the most respectable schools in this country, give this definition:—

"The art of interpretation is the art of teaching what is the meaning of another's language; or that faculty which enables us to attach to another's language the *same meaning* that the author himself attached to it." p. 2.

"Every word must have some meaning. To every word there ought to be assigned, and in the Scriptures there is unquestionably assigned, some idea or notion of a thing which we call the meaning or sense of a word." p. 7.

I need not pronounce a panegyric on Thomas Hartwell Horne's "Introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," a work so well known to the American literati, and so highly commended as exhibiting all the literature of the present age on the subject of interpretation, and on the critical study of the Holy Scriptures. I shall content myself with a quotation from vol. 2 p. 504 on the signification of words:—

"Since," says he, "words compose sentences, and these form senses, it is necessary to ascertain the *individual meaning* of words before we proceed farther to investigate the sense of Scripture. In the prosecution of this important work, we may observe, generally, that as the same method and the same principles of interpretation are common both to the same volume and to the productions of uninspired men, consequently the signification of words in the Holy Scriptures must be sought precisely in the same way in which the meaning of words in other works usually is or ought to be sought. Hence, also, it follows that the method of investigating the signification of words in the Bible is no more arbitrary than it is in other books, but is in like manner regulated by certain laws drawn from the nature of languages. And since *no text in scripture has more than one meaning*, we must endeavor to find out that *one true sense* precisely as we would investigate the sense of Homer or any other ancient writer; and in that sense when ascertained we ought to acquiesce, unless by applying the just rules of interpretation, it can be shown that the meaning of the passage has been mistaken, and that another is the only just, true, and critical sense of the place. These are the principles and rules to which we inflexibly adhere." But many preachers and some writers seem to prefer the following maxims:—The Rabbinic maxim is, "On every point of the Scriptures hang suspended mountains of sense." The Talmud says, "God so gave the law to Moses that a thing can be shown to be clean and unclean 49 ways." "Most of the Fathers," says Moros, "and a multitude of the commentators in later times, were infected with these principles. Little more than a century ago the celebrated Cocceius of Leyden maintained the sentiment that all the possible meanings of a word in the Scriptures are to be united. By his learning and influence a powerful party were raised up in the Protestant church in favor of such a principle. The mischiefs resulting from it have not yet ceased to operate." [So say I.] "Ernesti denies the possibility of truly interpreting any book by other means than those which are philological." "Those fanatics, therefore, are not to be regarded, who, despising literature and the study of the

languages, refer every thing merely to the influence of the Spirit; not that we doubt the influence of the Spirit, or that men truly pious and desirous of knowing the truth are assisted by it in their researches specially in those things that pertain to faith and practice." [This I quote to show that the writer is orthodox.]

We could fill a little volume with such quotations in proof that we have the concurrence of all the learned who have either translated the scriptures or guided students in ascertaining the meaning of them, who are now regarded by the present generation as worthy of esteem. So that our opponents cannot accuse us of adopting novel rules of interpretation while they accuse us of educing novel conclusions. They are the innovators on established principles of interpretation, not we. Indeed nine-tenths of the popular declaimers have no standard of interpretation whatever but their own conceits.

What, then, means the word *regeneration* in the New Testament? I have shown this in the Extra, and what does my friend Andrew allege against it? No criticism upon the term. He opposes, however, the opinion of Dr. Scott as a *commentator* against Macknight as a *critic* and *translator!!* He tells us that "if several judicious and evangelical writers" "agree in considering Titus 3—5 as referring to baptism, none of them, I am confident, exclude a *spiritual* regeneration." If he had said "the renewal of the Holy Spirit" instead of "spiritual regeneration," he might have placed me among them: for I exclude not "the moral or spiritual change," if I may use these scholastic terms, while I contend, with *all critics*, not with all *commentators*, (for the half of them are mere retailers, or system-builders, or dreamers) that the washing of regeneration is another name for baptism. I exclude not the renewal of the Holy Spirit, the renovation of the soul of man by the Holy Spirit; but this I cannot call spiritual regeneration, because it is a barbarous, unscriptural, and confounding distinction. Mr. Brantley and my friend Andrew often talk of "*baptismal regeneration*" as contemptuously as the orthodox or Hicksite Quaker speaks of "water baptism." The Quaker ridicules "water baptism," but extols his "spiritual baptism," with precisely the same logic as these gentlemen speak of "spiritual regeneration" in contrast with "baptismal regeneration." I regard them as equally unscriptural distinctions; I will not say as equally fanatical and enthusiastic, because this might savor of their spirit—but I must say equally unscriptural distinctions. There are a respectable army of *ifs* arrayed in the remarks of my friend Andrew on the subject of the 10th proposition in the Extra.—"If there be an allusion to baptism"—"if several writers of this class"—"if the term *regenerated*"—and these are followed by such phrases as "allowing," "be it so," &c. Why did he not manfully concede the thing at once, or if he thought it ought not to be conceded, why not defend some proposition, or wholly oppose ours? "But why," says he, "did not Mr. C. undertake to show some analogy between the "wind blows where it listeth" and being "born of the water?" Very shrewd, indeed! Because being born of the Spirit is one thing to which that phrase alludes, and being born of the water is another thing to which that phrase does not specially or

specifically belong. But he is so full of "spiritual regeneration," and so opposed to "water regeneration," that he cannot see that to be "born of water" is one thing, and "to be born of the Spirit" is another, though both may be contemporaneous.

To be born again, however, with him, means only and wholly a spiritual change. A person, with him, can be born again, or regenerated, without any water, font or basin. With him, the phrase "*born of water*" means nothing; for a person is born again, on his theory, before, and indeed without immersion, or even sprinkling.

We are aware that few figures will bear a universal accommodation to fact; but to lose sight of the subject altogether, and to have no accommodation, is the other extreme. Our author here makes himself merry at my accommodation of this figure, as he supposes, beyond all analogy. It is true, if he were to be my interpreter it would seem as if I had transcended the bounds of just accommodation. But he does not consider me as using the phrase "*begotten of God*," and "impregnated by the word," as two expressions of the same idea. This he ought to have seen from the very page from which he makes the quotation. On page 29, we say—"Provided that he has been begotten of God; or, that he has been impregnated by the gospel." This observed, and the laugh is on the other side. The same inadvertance is observable in his note on the "*still born*." We supposed not the application of the whole analogy in reference to one and the same subject. It was on our part a mere accommodation of the figure, with a simple reference to *the act of being born*, regarding the immersion as another name for the new birth, and not to the whole analogy of begetting, quickening, &c. A laugh, however, is good for the nervous; and, no doubt, it was necessary at this crisis of the review, as our author was evidently much perplexed with "*if*" and "*be it so*."

While I am noticing those places in which our author has surpassed me in ingenuity and wit; where he has evidently, in his own judgment, and, doubtless, in the estimation of a majority of his readers, corrected my use of some figures, I must not pass over the note on the bottom of page 40, where he has brought out "Campbell versus Campbell." In my debate with Mr. Walker and Mr. McCalla, I objected to the substitution of the word *regenerated* for *immersed* in the Extracts from Ireneus, and other of the primitive Fathers, as they are called, on the ground of their not being exactly representations of the same idea universally. I admitted that sometimes they used the term regenerated for baptized, but not always; and, indeed, not at all, in *the popular sense* of regenerated. Well, now it comes to pass that I represent all the primitive Fathers as using the term regenerated as equivalent to the term baptized. All this is true. And what then? Why, at that time I used the word regenerated as expressive of a *spiritual change*, and found that these Fathers spake of a *spiritual* change as well as we. I could not, therefore, reconcile this to the exclusive application of the term *regenerated* to the act of immersion; but on a more accurate and strict examination of their writings, and of the use of this term in the New Testament, I am assured that they used

the term regenerated as equivalent to immersion, and spoke of the spiritual change under other terms and modes of speech—just in the style we now speak, contrasting "the washing of regeneration" with "the renewal of the Holy Spirit." Such is the victory gained, in this instance, by my friend Andrew, and thus has he damaged the mortar in the walls of our fortress. Having, then, given to my ingenious opponent the credit which is due to his superior penetration in these striking instances, I proceed to the subject.

The doctrine of the Extra on the definition of the term regenerated is no farther impaired than these notices of the ingenuity of my friend indicate. That regeneration in Titus 3—5, and that "*being born of water*," John 3—5, mean immersion, the proper subject of examination according to the proposition submitted, is not only evident from the reasons, arguments, and testimonies adduced in the Extra, but from additional documents of the highest authority.

It is a question to be decided before the tribunal to which Professor Stuart alleges all great questions of religious faith and practice are to be brought—an accurate and critical knowledge of the terms used by the Apostles. It is not the feelings, taste, creed, experience, or religious education of a person, which is to decide the meaning and acceptation of the words and sentences of the sacred writings. To the canons of criticism, to the laws of interpretation, all such matters must be submitted.

Since writing the Extra I have added to my library one of the most learned and critical works in the world upon all questions connected with the interpretation of the New Testament. I allude to the "*Introduction to the New Testament, by J. D. Michaelis, late Professor in the University of Gottingen—Translated from the fourth German edition, and augmented with a Dissertation on the origin and composition of the three first Gospels, by Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. A. S. Lord Bishop of Petersborough, in 6 volumes—Fourth London edition*, 1823."

This work is, as far as I know, by common consent in the literary world, placed at the head of the list of critical works on the New Testament. I found, the other day, the following remarks, which the reader will please compare with what I wrote in the Extra on this subject some 15 months ago—

"But there are instances where the understanding the Rabbinisms is of still greater importance. Regeneration παλιγγενεσια, admits in the Greek of several significations, viz. 1. The Pythagorean transmigration of a soul into a new body, which, in the proper sense of the word, is a new birth. 2. The resurrection of the dead. 3. A revolution, such as took place at the deluge, when a new race of men arose. 4. The restoration of a ruined state. The word is used in one of these senses, Matth. xix. 28. but not one of them is applicable to Titus iii. 5. or the conversation of Christ with Nicodemus in the third chapter of St. John, who has used, instead of the substantive, the verb γεννηθηναι ανωθεν.—In both these passages the regeneration is ascribed to water, which circumstance alone might have led a commentator, acquainted with the language of the Rabbins, to the right explanation: especially as Christ himself implies, by his answer to Nicodemus, ch. iii. 10. that he is speaking of a regeneration, that might be expected to be understood by a Rabbi. Various have been the con-

jectures on the meaning of this expression, and opinions have been formed on so important a subject and so unusual an expression, without knowledge of the language of the Rabbins, or a due regard to the connexion. It has been imagined that Christ intended to express a total alteration of religious sentiments and moral feeling, that was to be effected by the influence of the Holy Spirit and of baptism. But how could Nicodemus suppose that this was the meaning? By what motive could Christ have been induced to have used a term not only figurative, but even taken in a new sense to express what he might have clearly explained in a literal and simple manner? And with what justice could he censure Nicodemus for his ignorance on a subject, of which, according to this explanation, he could never have heard. It would occasion a long and tedious inquiry to enter into a minute detail of the various explanations of this passage; and it will be sufficient to mention that which naturally follows from a knowledge of the Rabbinical doctrines. In the language of the Rabbins, 'to be born again,' signifies 'to be accepted by God as a son of Abraham, and by following the example of his faith to become worthy of this title.' In this sense the connexion is clear, the language is such as might be expected towards a master in Israel, and the water to which Christ alludes, is that used in the baptism of a proselyte, to which the Rabbins ascribed a spiritual regeneration."

Next to Michaelis, or according to others, in the same desk with him, is Thomas Hartwell Horne, on Titus 3 & 5, vol. 2, p. 498. He says—"In this passage *baptism* [by immersion in water, probably—candid for a Paidobaptist Doctor, truly] is said to signify *not only the moral ablution of sin*, but also the death and burial of guilty man, and (by his emersion from the water) his resurrection* to a pure and virtuous life; or in other words, our death unto sin, and our obligation to walk in newness of life."

Timothy Dwight, D. D. the author of the most popular system of Theology in the United States—one of the greatest of "American Divines," whose works are stereotyped even in old England, says: "*To be born again*," vol. 4, p. 301. "is precisely the same thing as to be born of water and of the Spirit." And what is it to be born of water? "*To be born of water is to be baptized.*" p. 300.

Those Presbyterians who accuse us of uncharitableness had better read the declaration of this their great Nicodemus, vol. 4, p. 302—"It is, however, to be observed here, that he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, WILL NEVER ENTER THE VISIBLE NOR INVISIBLE KINGDOM OF GOD." I request my friend Andrew to read this twice, and to recollect, while accusing me as the most uncharitable of men, there was at least one great man as uncharitable as me. Thus spoke the President of Yale, the Rabbi of American Presbyterianism.

My friend Andrew has an easy and cheap way of replying to such matters. He can ask the reader, as he does, p. 8, "Is this his acceptation of the word?"!! Or he can throw Thomas Scott, or old Flavel's Husbandry Spiritualized, into the scale, and write upon the beam—"One man's opinion is as good as another's," and so the business is done. I could add to this extract many others, from the most renowned Biblical critics, all expressive of the same view. Bishops Bennet and Pierce, in addition to the names in the Extra, I have since exa-

* Resurrection and regeneration are expressive of a similar change. The first born from the dead was the first person raised to die no more.

mined, and may enrol with Michaelis and Marsh. But I will give one hundred and fifty-one testimonies of high repute, among whom are one hundred and twenty-one Divines, ten Lords, and twenty Commoners of the British Parliament, who have decided that John 3 & 5, "*born of water*," and Titus 3 & 5, "*the washing of regeneration*," allude to baptism. This decision is found in the Larger Catechism, made in and by the above assemblage of Divines, approved by the British Parliament, and sanctioned by more than *one hundred thousand preachers*, which in Britain and America, for *one hundred and eighty-nine years*, have bound it on the conscience of *millions* of human beings.—"*Question* 165. What is baptism?" "*Answer.* Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament in which Christ has ordained the washing with water, &c. to be a sign of engrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit:" "as proof see," say they, "John 3 & 5, Except a man be born of water, &c. and Titus 3 & 5, He saved us by the washing of regeneration, &c." That this refers to baptism is, in the judgment of all this learned host, most certain. To sum up the authority for the criticisms offered on these phrases, we shall just state—

1. In the Extra I have shown that *all* "the Apostolic Fathers" and "primitive writers," as they are usually styled, to a man, concurred in this.

2. I have adduced many of the greatest scholars, critics, and translators, as also asserting it: and I know not of one *critic* or *translator*, of any acknowledged literary eminence, who does not assert it.

3. And in the third place, we have now adduced the Westminster Divines, the Parliament of England, and a hundred thousand preachers, since that time, asserting it.

Now let me ask, will the experiences, or feelings, or guesses, or criticisms of Messrs. Clopton, Brantley, Semple, and perhaps John Taylor, G. McConnico, and Silas M. Noel, D. D.!! with some of the *present opponents of reform*, be an offset to all this!

But we go for the plain common sense interpretation in these passages, and would not have arrayed this formidable band, had our friend presumed to examine my Extra on its own merits. This authority weighs only when it sustains the plain grammatical construction, and coincides with the whole scope of the context, and the tenor of the whole book; otherwise we have no use for it at all. It is an *argumentum ad hominem*. It is not, however, urged by us in proof of an opinion, or an article of faith, but in confirmation of a verbal criticism. How plain, then, must be the allusion to baptism in these passages, when so anciently, so uniformly, and so generally in our own times, perceived by all critics! This, however, would not be urged by me did I not discover a fondness on the part of our opponents to set aside all criticism, not only to discredit mine, but to appeal to some other tribunal than that which ascertains the meaning of the words used by the Apostles.

I know, indeed, that some critics like Adam Clark, with a system in their eyes, assert this to be the meaning of John 3 & 5, and Titus

3 & 5. But no sooner do they assert it, than they set it aside to make room for their system. Thus on Titus 3 & 5, he, with some regard to the literal import of the words "washing of regeneration," asserts—"UNDOUBTEDLY the Apostle here means baptism." Very true: what next?—"Baptism is only a *sign*, and therefore should never be separated from the thing signified." This is pretty good. But what next? "It is a rite (a rite!) commanded by God himself, and therefore the THING SIGNIFIED *should never be expected without it.*" Very true, and well said, upon the whole. Now if we hold Adam Clark to this saying, he will be as great a sinner as we in the eyes of spiritualizers. But he was too fearful and too *prudent* to stop here, and concludes by saying, "They who think baptism to be regeneration, [i. e. the renewal of the Spirit, for so he has just defined it] neither know the scriptures nor the power of God"! This will save Adam from reprobation. Now we are as far from confounding baptism and the renewal of the Holy Spirit as he can be; but we do not, ought not, and shall not call *the renewal of the Holy Spirit* the washing of regeneration, just because Paul has made them two things, connecting them by *and*. Moses *and* Aaron, we are simple enough to think, means *two* persons; not one person called both Moses and Aaron. Those who contend that Moses and Aaron mean only Aaron, may say that the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit mean only the renewal of the Holy Spirit.

Much more than enough has, we think, been said on this topic, and more than any man, we think, can set aside; and indeed my friend Andrew has not made a single effort to set it aside, except we take for criticism and argument his remote allusions to other passages, such as "being born again of incorruptible seed," &c. which reach not the case before us. We have shown how we understand all these expressions, and he has not corrected us of any error on that subject. But notwithstanding all that has been here said on Titus 3 & 5, I beg leave to conclude this article by an analysis of the passage—

"We also," says Paul, "were formerly foolish, deceived, disobedient," &c. but "when the philanthropy of God our Saviour shone forth," according to his mercy he saved us, not by any work of righteousness (for we had none to show) which we had done; but he saved us by washing away our sins in immersion, and by giving us his Holy Spirit, or by renovating our souls by his Holy Spirit. A *real* remission, and a *real* holiness of spirit, are to be two great items constituting the present salvation. Faith and immersion put us in possession of the former, and the Holy Spirit produces the latter. It is not a typical or shadowy remission and sanctification, like that bestowed before the *philanthropy* of God in the gift of his Son *shone forth;* but since the Sun of Mercy shone forth, he saved us by a *real remission*, the washing of regeneration—and by a *real holiness*, the renewal of the Holy Spirit. Such, according to all the rules of interpretation, is Paul's meaning, receive or reject it who may. And here are the two sayings of the Saviour verified—"Except a man be born of the water," and except "a man be born of the Spirit," he cannot enjoy a real and cer-

tain remission of his sins, or a real holiness in state, in principle, and character; he cannot enter the kingdom of God, the kingdom of righteousness, peace, joy, and the Holy Spirit.

Immersion, therefore, only *regenerates* the believer; but the Holy Spirit promised *renews* his spirit and temper, creates him anew in knowledge, righteousness, and real holiness; transforms his spirit, and induces him, as a new born babe, to desire the unadulterated milk of the Word, that he may grow thereby. To be regenerated is only to be born again; and what is it to be born in comparison to being educated in the Lord? The birth is soon accomplished; but the education, the new creation of a person, is not the offspring of an agony, of an effort, but the entire transformation of the man—the result of the Monitor, the Spirit which proceeds from the Father and the Son.

Immersion is only the washing of regeneration; it is only the putting off the old man, laying aside the filthy garments; it is only the purgation of moral pollution through faith in the blood of the great sacrifice. This, however, is necessary previous to our adoption into the family of God, our introduction into the kingdom of Jesus, our enrolment among the pupils of the great Teacher. But "the renewal of the Holy Spirit" is the entire purification of the heart, the decoration of the character, the fitting of the separated for an inheritance among the sanctified. To call the latter regeneration, is most derogatory to its dignity and importance. Hence they who so denominate it have low and unbecoming ideas of the christian's life, character, and true dignity. *They make all his dignity to consist in mere birth.* 'Tis education and not birth makes the christian, as it makes the man: but yet, unless a person is born he cannot be educated; unless he enter the kingdom of Jesus he cannot enjoy the rights of a citizen.

How little of this matter, as we have discussed it, my friend Broaddus understands, will appear from his remarks on my dialogue on political regeneration. He says—

"The ingenious dialogue on *political regeneration*, p. 33—4. might be happily accommodated to the visible kingdom of Christ, and its peculiar privileges, but from the application of it in the "Extra," to illustrate the argument, that the spiritual or divine birth is no other than baptism; and thus to resolve an internal, spiritual operation, into an external, bodily act, from this application of the figure, we must enter our unhesitating and absolute dissent."

This is just all we meant by it. And strange that our Examiner did not before perceive that we regard, and did remark in the Extra, that the phrase "*born again*," and regeneration, had exclusive respect to the present kingdom of Jesus Christ, and not to the future and eternal kingdom!!! Our Lord who introduced it, at that time had respect to his kingdom and its privileges, and never gave it any other meaning. I trust by this time our friend Andrew will perceive what injustice he has done our views, and will be disposed to make reparation. His scheme makes every thing of the new birth, or regeneration; we only make a *birth* of it, and lay all emphasis upon the subsequent renewal of our hearts by the Holy Spirit. To be noble born, of a royal line, is no doubt a great matter; but very little in comparison to a divine

education. The having a character "internal and external," (pardon this use of a popular phrase) formed by the Holy Spirit, is a much greater matter. A few remarks now on conversion will, I hope, correct his misrepresentations of this subject.

CONVERSION.

I trust the reader will not expect me to notice every little remark in this little pamphlet of 56 pages. This would be a work of supererogation. I have now, in my judgment, fully defended the Extra, and fully corrected my friend Andrew on all the great matters in it; but for the prejudiced, and the slow of apprehension, we have to make many repetitions under new forms of speech—such must be my remarks on conversion.

Conversion and regeneration are in some important points two names for the same thing, as shown in the Extra. But when we change a figure, we must speak in accordance with the change. When Christ says "I am the true vine," it would not do to say my Father is the king, or shepherd, but the vinedresser. When he says he is the good shepherd, it would not do to say his disciples were children, but sheep. This explains my meaning. When we speak of conversion, we cannot speak of begetting, quickening, or being born; for these belong to another figure: and though conversion in the history of a returning sinner may denote that same act in another figure, called being born, or regenerated, yet it will not accord with propriety to speak of it in all, or any of the same terms, warrantable under another figure. This remark apprehended corrects sundry mistakes in the minds of those undiscriminating sectaries who must always speak in the set phrase of orthodoxy.

The prodigal son first reflected, reasoned, and determined in his heart to turn his face to his father, before he made one step homeward. But his first step would, in all propriety, be called his turning or conversion, being the consummation of his resolutions, and made in pursuance of a change of mind; and without which all his thinking, grieving, resolving, &c. would have left him among the swine. So it is in conversion to God. The sinner convinced of his lost and ruined condition, realizing it, reflecting and resolving through the belief of the Divine testimony to accept the tendered pardon and salvation, determines first in himself to turn and live. His first step under this figure is into the grave of Jesus. He descends that he may rise with the Saviour. This is his turning to God; this is the overt act which is the consummation of his previous change of heart, and without which his faith would have been imperfect, and his repentance without that evangelical reformation leading into life. This is the constitutional reformation or conversion to God which was taught and practised in the age of the Apostles. Now-a-days it is out of fashion with the Quakers, and metamorphosed into infant sprinkling or infant immersion by the Greek and Roman Churches and their descendants. They all show their regard for water, and lay so much emphasis upon it as to apply it in a few drops, in many instances without faith in

the subject provided they can find faith in a natural father, or even in an artificial father called a godfather. They, not we, lay an undue emphasis on water. With them a few drops, without any knowledge or faith in the subject, becomes, according to the creed, a *sign* of engrafting into Christ, of remission of sins, and of regeneration. This is the ultraism of mystic Babylon. These are "the watery bigots," if such there be. With us immersion is nothing in infant or adult unless preceded and accompanied by a "living faith," in the Son of God. But with that it is the scriptural "washing of regeneration," or conversion to God; but no more. The renewing of the heart by the Holy Spirit, and the transforming of the soul by the powers of "the world to come, or the reign of Jesus Christ, is the great matter as respects the enjoyment of eternal life in the first fruits on earth, as preparatory to the fulness of joy and the eternal pleasures in the presence of God forever. Conversion is, then, according to the Extra, the actual turning of a sinner to God, in his institutions. Hence the command *convert* the nations, *immersing* the believers into the name, &c. *teaching* them to observe all that the Lord has commanded.

If we compare the christian life to a race, or to a campaign, we find the same regard to the propriety of figures is necessary; and, indeed, the Apostle alludes to these as useful analogies. In a race there is the starting point, the prescribed course, the laws of the race, and the goal. If in a race, says Paul, any one contend for the mastery, he receives not the crown unless he strive according to the laws of the race—(for I quote the meaning, not the words.) He must start according to law, run according to law, and touch the goal according to law, or he receives not the prize. "So run that you may obtain."—*Conversion* is just the entrance, or starting point in this race. If a soldier would receive a crown, he must first *enlist;* but this only brings him into the army. "Sure I must fight if I would reign." "The conqueror shall inherit all things." But yet no man is according to law a soldier who has not received the bounty, or given and received the pledge stipulated in such cases. But why multiply illustrations? Conversion is neither internal nor external. It originates in the mind, as all rational acts do. (A man, according to our American and English Grammar sense, cannot be guilty of murder unless it begin in the heart.) But it cannot be perfected there. "With the heart man believes *into* righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made *into* (*eis* in both cases) salvation. Confession is always made in the act, or at the time of immersion. "If you believe with all your heart you may be immersed." I do believe, said the Eunuch. Then Philip immersed him *into* the Lord Jesus. He was then converted according to the New Testament. I know those who plead for camp meeting conversions, anxious seats, and mourning benches, will denounce this as heterodox. But whom the Lord commends will be justified in the last day.

But my friend Andrew is very ingenious at times; and while we say Paul was sent to convert the nations, Andrew quotes these words from Paul, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to proclaim the gos-

pel." If we had forgotten this, it would have doubtless been considered an unanswerable argument. *Paul was sent to preach the gospel, and not to baptize: but he did baptize.* Hence we infer Paul baptized without any authority! Good logic! Is it not? If Christ authorized him not to baptize, and he did baptize some, as he positively affirms, must he not have baptized without authority!! This proves too much for Andrew; for he will not allow any person to immerse who is not sent to baptize and duly authorized.

If, then, Paul immersed without authority, who dare condemn any disciple, unlicensed by a church, for doing that which Paul did without any commission either from Jesus or the church!!! Perhaps this will bring my friend to reflect a little more closely upon the reasons why Paul was not commanded to baptize. He found himself authorized to baptize when he pleased; the exemption, then, must have been out of some particular regard to Paul's *person* or *mission*. He was no *fisherman* like the Twelve. He was not of that robust constitution. My bodily presence is weak, says he: and history gives him not size enough to baptize. But as he was the Apostle to the Gentiles, and the *only one*, his baptizing might have been represented as into his own name. At all events, *on this account* he thanked God that he had baptized so few in Corinth. But he always had companions with him, Paul and Silas—Paul and Timotheus—"Paul, and the brethren with me"—"I would have kept Onesimus to have ministered to me, Philemon; but as he was your servant, I would not do it without your consent." These obeyed his orders as faithfully as the Jews at Cesarea obeyed Peter when commanded to immerse the Gentiles. It is nothing to the purpose to urge the fact that Jesus Christ, either from a regard to Paul's personal weakness, stature, or great labors, exempted him from this service so long as he said, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." When any repented and desired immersion, he put the labor on others, only when it happened, as in the Philippian jail, or in some families in Corinth. But, really, it looks like trifling to answer an objection of this sort; and the more so because it bears equally against all except the Quakers. Thus many make a sophism out of it. But my friend Andrew cannot; for if Paul could accomplish every thing necessary to the salvation of the Gentiles by simply preaching, *Why does Andrew baptize?* His answer to this question will show how impertinent it is to his purpose, to allege it either as an objection or a difficulty lying at my door. It lies rather at his, on more accounts than one.

TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS.

Before alleging any thing in favor of the testimony of "the Apostolical Fathers," we shall permit our good friend to make his charge:

"But will Mr. C. indeed say, that he considers the title of "Apostolical Fathers" to be justly due to those writers? I think not Will he candidly avow that he believes any of those writers whom he has quoted, were the "contemporaries or the pupils of the Apostles?" I am persuaded he will hsrdly do this Was it fair, then, to present them in this imposing light, even though

they are so considered by some? "Yet (says he) the views and practices of those who were the contemporaries, or the pupils, of the Apostles and their immediate successors, may be adduced," &c. Alas! alas! to what lengths may the love of a man's own theory drive him!"

If this was not *ad captandum vulgus*, to inveigle the unwary, or to excite the indignation of the orthodox, it looks very like it. I call the writers quoted "the Apostolic Fathers," prefixing those words, "as they are usually called." This is in conformity with all antiquity and with modern usage. I neither defend nor impugn their title to this character. I found them, as lawyers say, *tenens locum*, in possession of the title, and found it unnecessary to inquire into the records. But one sentence which he ought to have quoted to do me justice in the esteem of those who never read the Extra, and which indeed would have neutralized his censure, is that immediately preceding the extracts from Barnabas' Epistle. I shall now quote it from the Extra, page 42. "Whether the writing be genuine or spurious, it is on all hands admitted to be a fragment of the highest antiquity." This was all that was necessary to my purpose, and the only use I make of it. It was not necessary for me to settle any question about the authorship, because their testimony was not urged as having any *authority* upon the faith of christians then or now; but only as a collateral document—as a circumstantial evidence that in the first ages *all writers*, of every reputation, either for talents, piety, or intimacy with the converts made by the Apostles, unequivocally and unanimously attest that such was the meaning of certain words, phrases, and usages among all called Christians, orthodox or heretical, in those early days.

But would it not have been more in accordance with reason and more satisfactory to his readers to have adduced, or attempted to adduce some contradictory testimony, or some document to set aside or impair my eleventh proposition. Is all antiquity so silent on the views of my opponent as not to furnish one document, hint, nor allusion in vindication of his views of the points at issue?

My 11th proposition is in the following words: "*All the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called, all the pupils of the Apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the four first centuries, whose writings have come down to us, allude to, and speak of, christian immersion as the "regeneration" and "remission of sins" spoken of in the New Testament.*" This proposition I have sustained, Andrew Broaddus himself being judge; for he has not brought a shadow of proof to the contrary. But there is a paragraph preceding this proposition in the Extra, which I must transcribe for the sake of those who may not have it to refer to. It explains the use, the *sole use* we make of the numerous and decisive witnesses we summon to sustain this proposition. It reads thus:—

"Though no article of christian faith, nor item of christian practice, can, legitimately, rest upon any testimony, reasoning, or authority, out of the sacred writings of the Apostles, *were it only one day after their decease*; yet the views and practices of those who were the co-

temporaries, or the pupils of the Apostles, and their immediate successors, may be adduced as corroborating evidence of the truths taught, and the practices enjoined by the Apostles; and, as such, may be cited; still bearing in mind, that where the testimony of the Apostles ends, christian faith necessarily terminates." Candid reader, does not this preliminary remark show how uncalled for were the censures of my zealous friend Andrew?

To discredit the testimony of these "venerable ancients," as they are called, my friend alleges their *opinions* on other matters, showing how whimsical they were in some things. Grant it, and what then? Does any man's private opinions discredit his testimony on any question of fact? If so, how do we receive the canonical books of the New Testament? Upon the very testimony here adduced, so far as we regard *human* testimony at all. Andrew does not see where his imputations terminate! But he admits them to be competent witnesses of facts, and would take them out of our hands by this question, "When Origen testifies that infants were baptized for the remission of sins, does he not as clearly testify to the fact that infants were baptized, as that they were baptized for the remission of sins?" I say, Yes, and who says No! And have I not *always* admitted that in Origen's time infants were immersed? Have I not affirmed, upon the testimony of Tertullian and Origen, that in Tertullian's time infants in some cases began to be immersed!! How impertinent to the subject are these allegata against the formidable host of witnesses during four hundred years! And is this all that can be offered upon or against my 11th proposition!

The 12th also is passed by with little less formality. All the orthodox creeds attest in words fairly construed all that we allege on this subject. Andrew would except only the Regular Baptist. Though it differs not in any material point from the Presbyterian, he *says* it confirms his views. I *say* it confirms mine; and so the account is balanced. "Baptism is the sign of remission of sins," says the Creed. I say so too. So is my seal to a bond a sign that it is valid; so is giving the hand a sign of marriage. But if we must use the word *sign*, I will say with Adam Clarke, as before quoted, "THE THING SIGNIFIED SHOULD NOT BE EXPECTED WITHOUT THE SIGN." So ends the examination of my 12th proposition.

THE FATE OF MY TWELVE PROPOSITIONS;
OR,
A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE WHOLE "EXTRA EXAMINED."

The *first six propositions* are admitted by my examinator as fully proved. The *seventh* he will not controvert. The *eighth* is admitted, and a question stated, "*What is the command by which the gospel is obeyed?*" He assumes the command to be *faith*. I have reviewed this, and shown that naked faith never can be both *the principle* and *the act* of obedience. There is no obedience without *the will*, and the command must be apprehended, heard, or believed before obeyed

My *ninth* proposition our Reviewer would admit if qualified. The proposition is, that "*it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith, which changes our state.*" He would thus qualify it, p. 19: "If our author had been willing to qualify his position; if he had said a faith that is not active is nothing: or a profession of the principle is nothing *without the proper action*, allowing for circumstances; then we think we could have met him here on scriptural grounds." I accede to all this. I object not to the qualification. So, then, there is no dispute upon the *ninth* proposition. Yet after all this, Andrew sets himself to disprove his own qualification of the proposition, and quotes Gen. xv. 6. to show that faith in the promise found in the sixth verse, including no doubt the great blessing promised, Gen. xii. 3. was accounted to Abraham for righteousness, without any obedience, any act resulting from faith. "Here," says he, "no external act is interposed between the act of believing and the imputation of righteousness." How short the vision! how near-sighted the eye compressed with a human system! This flatly contradicts both Moses and Paul, Heb. xi. 8, 9, and 12. Abraham was called before Isaac was born, and he obeyed that call before what is recorded Gen. xv, 6. occurred. So Paul and Andrew may settle this matter when they meet. Paul says, By faith Abraham *when* he was called *obeyed.* This was when he was 75 years old, twenty-five years before Isaac was born, and more than forty before he offered up Isaac upon the altar! To quote the words of Andrew on this same proposition, "We have satisfactory evidence, at least, that the justification of the soul is by the *immediate* act of faith." p. 20. So he disposes of the 9th proposition.

The *tenth* proposition is, that "*Immersion and Regeneration are two Bible names for the same act, contemplated in two different points of view.*" This proposition he would seem to controvert; but in fact has to admit it, because the only place where *regeneration* occurs in the New Testament on which there is any controversy is Titus iii. and 5. It was not, as my friend affirms, upon the authority of M'Knight's translation and explanatory note, and the opinion of some other commentators, that I apply Titus iii. and 5. to baptism. These are only corroborating and collateral evidences. I rest it upon the passage itself, and upon a great variety of evidences in the Extra, and in the preceding pages. He concedes it with this qualification, that none of these writers "exclude a spiritual regeneration." If by "spiritual regeneration" they mean *the renewal of the Holy Spirit*, I agree with them; but this I have already proved to be an unscriptural use of the word. I have, I think, abundantly proved this to be a mistake of the question altogether. Regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit are not one and the same thing—Paul being judge, for he makes them *two.* Reader, attend! He makes them two things as distinct as Moses *and* Aaron.

Some Methodistic visionary in a Lexington newspaper, a year ago, if I mistake not, attempted to substitute for *regeneration* the word *baptism* in every place where it occurs, to explode the meaning assigned in the above proposition. This was as fanatical as if I had said

that Christ and Jesus represent the same person; and he to explode this substitutes the word *Jesus* for the word *Christ* in every place where it occurs in the Greek Testaments, Old and New. He can find many passages where other persons are called Christs or *Christ*, and thence infers it is not true that Jesus and Christ represent the same person!! He may have his exceptions as a reward for his ingenuity!!

The fate of the *eleventh* and *twelfth* propositions we have already showed. They cannot be opposed. They cannot be disproved. And where is the strength and jet of the controversy? Reader, I will tell you: it lies upon the 2d edition of the ninth proposition, page 13 of the Extra. There we propose to prove, not *analogically*, but from the *apostolic writings*, that "an act of faith, and not the principle of faith, changes our state;" in other words, that remission of sins is now promised through an immersion into the name, &c. resulting from faith in God's promise.

But before attending to Andrew's objections to this, let me premise: Having paid so much attention to those preliminary matters, and having been at so much pains to show that not one proposition yet cited from the Extra has been refuted by its examiner; the reader will, perhaps, by this time, have fallen into an error, which I beg leave to correct. From the attention paid to all the prominent matters quoted, and my defence of the Extra from all these imputations, the reader will suppose that the doctrine of the Extra is essentially resting upon the premises to which Andrew has objected, and which I have now defended; and that the reason why I have endeavored to show that all my propositions stand erect as the pyramids of Egypt, is because the doctrine of the Extra rests upon them as a house rests upon its foundation: than which nothing can be much more remote from the truth. From this error I beg leave to relieve the reader. The doctrine of the Extra is no more dependent on these preliminary matters than the constitution of the United States depends upon the will of the Court of St. James.

These propositions were the avenues through which we chose to approach the great proposition. But if these avenues were, or could be all blocked up, we could have approached it through many others, or, to speak without a figure, if my friend Andrew had swept from the arena every thing which he has questioned or impugned, the arguments on which we rely are the explicit declarations of the Apostles, and these yet remain unscathed.

This great question, *For* WHAT *is the penitent believer to be immersed?* or *What is the meaning or design of the christian immersion?* is to be decided neither from analogy, inference, nor figurative expressions, though all these may either illustrate or confirm the decision; but from the clear and express declarations of the New Testament. We arrange the evidences, direct and unequivocal, under the following heads:—

1. The commission to the Twelve, as recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

2. The four discourses of Peter recorded in the Acts of the Apostles—the Pentecostian address, the speech in Solomon's Portico, the speech to the Highpriest and Senate of Israel, and his address in the house of Cornelius.

3. The commission given to Saul, and Ananias' mission to him.

4. The comments on the gospel, or baptism and salvation, found in the Epistles of Paul.

5. The allusions and comments found in the Epistles of Peter and John.

6. The peculiar and discriminating genius and privileges of the Kingdom of Heaven, or Christian Institution, as explained in the whole New Testament, contradistinguished from every antecedent economy under which sinful man was placed.

These testimonies and evidences have, in another arrangement, been chiefly exhibited in the Extra; and how are they rebutted by Andrew Broaddus? Admitting that some of them clearly express immersion for the remission of sins, he attempts to show that a sinner is pardoned by faith, and this being "testimony that cannot yield to another construction," all the testimony showing that baptism is the medium of remission must be explained away, or shown to be figurative. This he alleges is accordant to a sound canon of interpretation. But he forgot that he assumed the thing to be proved. The previous question is not settled, *whether is remission of sins more literally and unequivocally connected with baptism than with faith?* He *assumes* the latter, and proceeds to apply his canon of interpretation.

We will take his canon of interpretation and show that the most literal, direct, and frequent allusions to remission, oblige us, upon his own rule, to understand the passages quoted in the Extra literally. No man is commanded to believe *for* the remission of his sins, in the whole New Testament; but he is commanded, when he has faith, "to reform and be baptized *for* the remission of his sins." Now a more literal passage than this is not to be found in the whole New Testament.

But "a man is said to be justified by faith." The question then is, Is justification and remission the same thing? This requires some discussion; and when agreed that they do mean the same thing, then another question arises which of the two is the most literal. This is all necessary to make way for his rule of interpreation, which says—"*When a point has been established by explicit testimony, testimony that cannot yield to any other construction, in such a case no apparently contravening matter,*" [an unhappy expression] *no apparently contradictory testimony "which can be rationally explained away, ought to be brought forward.*" But the question is to be decided first which is the most explicit testimony. I say Acts ii. 38—he will say Rom. v. 1. But this with him is begged, not proved.

In examining the New Testament we find that a man is said to be "*justified by faith,*" Rom. v. 1; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 24—"*Justified freely by his grace,*" Rom. iii. 24; Titus iii. 7—"*Justified by his blood,*" Rom. v. 9—"*Justified by works,*" James ii. 21, 24, 25—"*Justified in*

or by the name of the Lord Jesus," 1 Cor. vi. 11—"*Justified by Christ,*" Gal. ii. 16—"*Justified by knowledge,*" Is. liii. 11, as applied to persons in the New Testament. "It is God that justifies," says Paul, "by these *seven* means—by Christ, his name, his blood, by knowledge, grace, faith, and by works." Are these all literal? Is there no room for interpretation here? He that selects faith out of *seven,* must either act arbitrarily, or show his reason; but the reason does not appear in the text. He must reason it out: he must infer it. Why then assume that faith *alone* is the reason of our justification? Why not assume that the *name* of the Lord alone is the great matter, seeing this name "is the only name given under heaven by which any man can be saved," and men "who believe receive *the remission of sins by his name,*" Acts x. 43; and especially, because the name of Jesus, or of the Lord, is more frequently mentioned in the New Testament in reference to all spiritual blessings than any thing else!! Call all these *causes,* or *means* of justification, and what then? We have the grace of God for the *moving* cause, Jesus Christ for the *efficient* cause, his blood for God's *instrumental* cause, faith an *instrumental* cause, knowledge an *instrumentul* cause, the name of the Lord for the *immediate* cause, and works for the *concurring* cause. For example; a gentleman on the sea shore descries the wreck of a vessel at some distance from land driving out into the ocean, and covered with a miserable and perishing sea drenched crew. Moved by pure philanthropy, he sends his son with a boat to save them. When the boat arrives at the wreck, he invites them in. A number of the crew stretch out their arms and seizing the boat with their hands spring into it, take hold of the oars, and row to land; while some, from cowardice, and others because of some difficulty in coming at the boat, wait in expectation of a second trip; but before it returned, the wreck went to pieces, and they all perished. The *moving* cause of their salvation who escaped, was the good will of the gentleman on the shore; his son, who took the boat, was the *efficient* cause; the boat itself was his *instrumental* cause; their hands and arms were their *instrumental* cause; the seizing the boat with their hands and springing into it was the *immediate* cause, and their rowing to shore, under the guidance of his son, was the *concurring* cause of their salvation.—Thus men are justified or saved by grace, by Christ, by his blood, by faith, by knowledge, by the name of the Lord, and by works. But of the *seven* causes, *three* of which are purely instrumental, why choose *one* of the instrumental, and emphasize upon it as the justifying or saving cause, to the exclusion of, or in preference to the others? Every one in its own place is essentially necessary.

If we examine the word *saved* in the New Testament, we shall find that we are said to be saved by as many causes, though some of them differently denominated, as those by which we are said to be justified. Let us see: We are said to be "saved by grace," Eph. ii. 5; "saved through his life," Rom. v. 9, 10; "saved through faith," Eph. ii. 8, Acts xvi. 31; "saved by baptism," 1 Peter iii. 21; or "by faith and baptism," Mark xvi. 16; or "by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit," Titus iii. 5; or "by the gospel," 1 Cor. xv. 2; or by "calling upon the Lord," and by "enduring to the

end," Acts ii. 21. Rom. x. 13. Matth. x. 22. Here we have salvation ascribed to grace, to Jesus Christ, to his death and resurrection—*three* times to baptism, either by itself or in conjunction, once with faith, and once with the Holy Spirit; to works, or to calling upon the Lord, and to enduring to the end. To these we might add other phrases nearly similar, but these include all the causes to which we have just now alluded. Saved by grace, the *moving* cause; by Jesus the *efficient* cause; by his death and resurrection and life, as his *instrumental* cause; by faith, as an *instrumental* cause; or by faith and baptism, or by baptism, as the *immediate* cause; and by enduring to the end, or persevering in the Lord, as the *concurring* cause.

Are six of these less explicit, less literal than the seventh? This must be assumed, on his principles. And he does assume it: for he attempts not to prove that justified, or saved by faith, is more literal than "he that believes and is immersed shall be saved," or that "immersion does now save us," or "be immersed for the remission of sins." We shall now leave it to the reader to decide whether this rule of interpretation is applicable in the case as argued by my opponent or by me, feeling confident that if he doubt its applicability in my favor, he must be assured of its inapplicability in favor of my friend.

This is his effort to elude the positive and explicit declarations in the New Testament relative to remission of sins, as at all connected with baptism.

His next effort is to mend the king's version, and all others. Be baptized *for* the remission of sins, is *into* remission of sins!! That is, that Peter meant don't be afraid, you now believe and repent, you are forgiven, justified, and saved, &c. only be immersed into remission. You are remitted, but you have not got *into* remission. But by being immersed, you will be admitted into remission, being now remitted!! *Credat Judæus Appella non ego!* The reader will excuse me for pushing this matter further, for showing that a man *in* heaven need not do any thing to get *into* it!!

My friend, p. 25, very kindly *commutes* immersion for dispositition. He is willing to accept of the disposition for obedience; for "alms are accepted according to what a man hath." Reader, why not also say that a disposition to believe will just do as well as faith, provided a man cannot believe? This would relieve many: for there are more who say they wish to believe than who wish to be baptized, because of the want of ability. As he has accepted disposition for baptism, why not accept it for faith? According to this version, it should read—"He that believeth and is baptized, or has a disposition to be baptized, shall be saved." But I would recommend another version, to carry this commutation out: "He that believeth, or has a disposition to believe, and is baptized, or has a disposition to be baptized, shall be saved." That I may do him the greatest justice here, I will quote the passage which authorizes these remarks—p. 25. The query is: "Does not the connexion of the ordinance (baptism) in Acts ii. 38 and Mark xvi. 16 with repentance and remission of sins, and with faith and eternal salvation, represent a compliance with the institution as being requisite as an *evidence*, at least, of the blessings of forgiveness and an interest in the promise of eternal life?"

"*Answer.* It does appear so; or rather, a *disposition* of heart to comply: for the gracious King of Zion accepts according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not."

He gives us a page of very curious theory by way of illustration why our Lord so intimately connected salvation with baptism, and why Peter connected it so intimately with remission of sins. When the theory is examined, it appears that our friend discovered that it was because in the first age, in the times of persecution, it was necessary to prove the *sincerity* of the professors. It was only as a proof of *sincerity*, because of the troubles of that age; but now, persecutions having ceased, and the time expired for which this connexion was established, it is not so intimately connected as in the first century. This is the philosophy of his new theory!!

The train of things which has carried our examiner into these extremes, I

doubt not, is his benevolent desire to avoid the grievous conclusion which he so frequently alleges against me, as the direct tendency of affirming baptism for the remission of sins. That, I need not now tell the reader, is his inference, that all the unbaptized are in an unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and unsaved state He maintains that all who do not now believe in Jesus are in this state; he also teaches that it is much easier to be immersed than to believe. Hence he attaches salvation to the more unattainable of the two items connected with salvation in the commission, Mark xvi. 16. His scheme is but little more benevolent or charitable, (pardon the abuse of these words,) himself being judge, than that which he opposes. But, perhaps, he does not make even faith necessary. Disposition will do. But can there be a disposition to believe that which we think is not true! This is a question which, if justly answered, makes shipwreck of his theory of faith. But let us not wander from the subject. He has to force the bars of his own castle to admit into heaven all he thinks ought to be there without even faith. But my showing that he is inconsistent will not prove me consistent nor correct in this matter, and therefore we shall proceed.

I have repeatedly asserted and shown that regeneration has respect only to the present kingdom of grace in its scriptural import, and that faith and baptism are indispensable to admission into it; also, that the terms justified, sanctified, pardoned, &c. have respect to the present enjoyment of salvation. Hence infants, idiots, and all those who can neither hear nor understand the gospel, are excluded from the present salvation equally with those who wilfully despise and reject it. But this does not decide the eternal destiny of infants, idiots, pagans, or those who reject the gospel. Their destiny must be decided by other sayings in the book. Of one class the book speaks most distinctly: "They who know not God, and obey not the gospel, shall be destroyed with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." But even this is restricted to them who *hear* it. Indeed, the commission itself limits its promises of life and condemnation to those who hear it. When fully expressed in its full scope it reads thus: "Proclaim the gospel to the whole creation. Every one who hears it, believes it, and is immersed, shall be saved. Every one who hears it and believes it not, shall be condemned." This is its full meaning and scope. Now as respects those who do not hear it, whether infants, idiots, pagans, &c. we only affirm that they cannot enjoy the present salvation. But whether they can enjoy the future is another question, which lies no more against immersion than against faith. If my friend Andrew can prove the future salvation of infants, idiots, pagans, without faith, I will undertake to prove it without immersion. All that he can save without faith, I will (to speak in the same style) save without immersion. But where he requires faith I will require immersion.

But still up comes the delicate question, What comes of all the pious Turks, Jews, Pagans? No; that is no concern of ours, says my friend Andrew: but what comes of all the pious Catholics, Greeks, Protestants? The Greek and Roman Church say, "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins;" and they believe that infants are *sinners*, and therefore the former immerse and the latter sprinkle them; and that is baptism with them. All christendom either immerse or sprinkle, except the Quakers, and they go for spiritual sprinkling or spiritual immersion. "What havoc does baptism for the remission of sins make among all these!!" I simply say, *they are not in the kingdom of grace;* because Jesus said, "Except a man be born of *water* and of the *spirit* he cannot enter the kingdom of God." But he may accept *the will* for *the deed*, and admit them into the future kingdom, such of them as are *merely mistaken*, who are disposed to obey, or who think that they have obeyed, as he may accept infants and idiots into the future kingdom without faith or baptism.

George Whitfield, writing on John iii. 5. says, "Does not this verse urge the *absolute necessity of water baptism? Yes*, when it may be had. But how God will deal with persons unbaptized *we cannot tell.*" vol. 4. p 355. I say with him, *we cannot tell with certainty.* But I am of opinion that when a neglect

proceeds from a simple mistake or sheer ignorance, and when there is no aversion, but a will to do every thing the Lord commands, the Lord will admit into the everlasting kingdom those who by reason of this mistake never had the testimony of God assuring them of pardon or justification here, and consequently never did fully enjoy the salvation of God on earth. But I will say with the renowned President of Yale, that "he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter the visible nor invisible kin dom of God." By the "visible and invisible kingdom" he means the kingdoms of grace and glory. He adds on the same page, "He who persists in this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom." vol. 4. p 302. If there be in this any contradiction or opposition to the doctrine of the Extra on Remission, I perceive it not. If my friend Andrew perceives it, I wish him to ask himself whether he does not perceive that it lies equally against his own doctrine of *faith alone;* and that the only question is not about the *principle,* but the *number* excluded. If he excludes the pious Turk, Jew, and Pagan, without faith, and finds it compatible to save infants and idiots without faith, is not the contradiction as difficult to remove from his door as from mine?

Upon the whole, this is reasoning after the manner of men. Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Also, "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." Is it not safest, wisest, and best to plead for what is written, and to urge this upon all the unbaptized? What harm, or what 'pernicious consequences' will follow from it? "He that teaches men to violate or neglect one of the least of God's commandments, shall be of no account in the reign of God." Let my friend consider this once, twice, three times. Jesus said this, and I beseech him to consider whether this be not the drift and tendency of his pamphlet.

If human authority is to decide the truth or propriety of his views or mine, we have an overwhelming vote on our side. We have *all antiquity* for four hundred years. Not only does Wall assert and prove this, but Vitringa also. His words are, "The ancient christian church, from the highest antiquity, after the apostolic times, appears generally to have thought that baptism is absolutely necessary for all that would be saved by the grace of Jesus Christ." Tom, 1. 50 ii. c. 6. 9. Dr. Owen also "Most of the ancients concluded that baptism was no less necessary unto salvation than faith or repentence itself." On Justification, c. ii. page 183.

The Reformers, too, are theoretically on our side. We have before shown this. Even the last of them, John Wesley, asserts that "by baptism we enter into *covenant with God*, an everlasting covenant, are admitted into the church, made members of Christ, made the children of God. By *water* as the *means*, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again." [Preservative, page 146—150.] All creeds, the Greek, the Roman Catholic, and all the reformed assert it. The Roman Catholic and the Greek Church say, "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins. The Protestants say the same, as quoted in the Extra. And to these we add—

The Confession of Bohemia.—"We believe that whatsoever by baptism—is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all that doth the Lord God perform inwardly. That is, he washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him: for the bestowing of these excellent fruits was holy baptism given and granted to the church."

The Confession of Augsburg—"Concerning baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ: also, by baptism the grace of God is offered"

"The Confession of Saxony.—"I baptize thee—that is, I do witness that by this dipping thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

The Confession of Whittenburg.—"We believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the Prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

The Confession of Helvetia.—"To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, for to lead a new and innocent life."

The Confession of Sueveland.—"As touching baptism, we confess that it is the font of regeneration, washeth away sins and saveth us. But all these things we do understand as St. Peter doth interpret them. 1 Pet. iii. 21."

Westminster Assembly.—"Before baptism the minister is to use some words of instruction—showing that it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our engrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, and life eternal."

But while Protestants and Catholics, who differ so much on other matters, agree in this, it is no trivial proof of the plainness and fulness of the Holy Scriptures on this great subject. But as it is on them alone that we build, I shall now sum up the evidence they contain according to the outline proposed, page 41:

I shall give the three versions of the commission from the pens of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. "All authority is given to me in heaven and upon the earth. Go, convert all the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all the things that I have commanded you: and, behold, I am with you always, even to the conclusion of this state." Matth. xxviii.

"Go throughout all the world; proclaim the good tidings to the whole creation. He who shall believe and be immersed, shall be saved; and he who will not believe shall be condemned." Mark xvi. 16.

He commanded that "reformation and remission of sins should be proclaimed in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" [Luke.] Matthew details most minutely all the things to be done in converting the nations—preaching to all nations, baptizing the believers, and teaching them the christian institution. Mark gives a summary view of it and states the results:—He that shall believe and be baptized, shall be saved. Believing the gospel and being baptized has salvation connected. This is placing faith and immersion in the most conspicuous light. But Luke substitutes reformation for believing the gospel as the effect, or concomitant; and remission of sins for immersion as its effect or concomitant. Thus the commission is fully developed and the effects of preaching and baptizing unfolded, and we left at no loss to understand it. Luke shows us why he said that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. The order of things exhibited in the three versions is preaching, faith, or reformation, immersion, or remission of sins, or salvation. "What God has joined together let no man put asunder." This is our first argument.

2d. Peter, in his first discourse, when the question "*What shall we do?*" was proposed by thousands of believing penitents, when he first stood up to execute the duties assigned him in his commission, Acts ii. 38,—answered them in these words, "Reform and be immersed, every one of you, by the authority of the Lord, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." In this way he understood that reformation and remission of sins should be proclaimed among all nations. This was his sense of "He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved," This is our second argument.

3. In Solomon's Portico, in his second discourse, he was not asked by the audience what they should do. He mentions neither faith nor baptism, but substitutes such terms as he thought equivalent on that occasion: "Reform and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come, and that he may [again] send his Son" to consummate the whole. Here the blotting out of sin is made attendant on reformation and conversion, which word we have shown in the Extra was equivalent to baptism, because Jesus said, "Convert the nations, baptizing them," &c. Matth. xxviii. This is our third argument.

4. In his third discourse before the Senate, Acts v. 31, Peter represents the object of Christ's exaltation in accordance with the commission as explained by Luke, the writer of the memoirs of Jesus and the historian of the Acts of the Apostles. He says, "The God of our fathers has raised up Jesus, whom you slew, hanging him on a tree. Him has God exalted at his right hand, a Prince and a Saviour to give reformation to Israel and remission of sins. In the style of the same writer we again see reformation and remission connected, as in his account of the commission. This is a fourth argument.

5. In Peter's sermon to the Gentiles, he concludes, "To him gave all the Prophets witness, that every one who believeth on him shall receive remission of sins by his name." "Can any of you forbid water?" He then commanded the believers to be immersed by the authority of the Lord. Thus faith, the name of the Lord, and forgiveness of sins is announced to the Gentiles. Thus God made no difference between the Gentile and the Jew, purifying their hearts alike by faith, and granting to the Gentiles "reformation unto life." This is our fifth argument, and thus ends the preaching of Peter recorded by Luke.

But next comes the commission to Paul. "I send you," says Jesus, "to the Gentiles, to open their eyes, to bring them by the faith that is in me from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive the forgiveness of their sins, and an inheritance among the sanctified." The forgiveness of their sins is made consequent on their translation from the kingdom of Satan to God.—Acts xxvi.

Ananias' mission to Paul gives him instruction how to proceed: for this purpose he was sent to him to Damascus. He taught Paul in his own person how he was to act to others. "And now," said he, "why do you tarry? arise and be baptized and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Paul, in all probability, would never forget this lesson. This is our sixth argument.

In Paul's writings we have a full developement of his views of this matter. To the Romans he says—"So many of us as were immersed into Jesus Christ were immersed into his death. Baptism is not only for the remission of sins, but it is a death to sin. A dead person sins not; so christians should reckon themselves dead to sin." How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer in it, *baptized into his death*, into the efficacy and power of his sacrifice? A strong figure, truly! but it is a *figure of the truth*.

To the Corinthians Paul says—"You were once idolators; but now *you are washed*, you are justified, you are sanctified, by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. To the Galatians, "As many of you as have been immersed *into Christ*, have *put on Christ*." In baptism, then, the believer confesses the Lord; puts him on, assumes him as Prophet, Priest, and King. To the Ephesians he says—"The Lord cleansed the church *by the washing*, or a *bath of water*, and by the word." It was not a cleansing of the flesh, but of the spirit, from pollution as well as from guilt. Therefore he says, to the Hebrews, "Having our hearts cleansed from a guilty conscience, and our bodies washed with clean water, or water that makes clean." To the Colossians he is still more full: "By the circumcision of Christ"—"a circumcision made without hands"—we put off the body of the sins of the flesh," "buried with him in immersion." "Therefore, having risen with him, seek the things which are above."

We need not again cite his words to Titus. But from all these passages, on each of which a distinct argument may be grounded, may we not ask—Is not *the washing of regeneration*, as well as the *renewal of the Holy Spirit*, clearly, uniformly, and forcibly taught, both literally and figuratively? These we can only recapitulate, in this place; we have often expatiated on them before.

Peter, in allusion to immersion, says of certain characters, that they appear to forget "that they were purged from their old (or former) sins;" that others, like the washed hog, had returned to wallowing in the mire; and, stronger still, he affirms that as eight persons were saved by water in the ark, so the

antitype, or thing corresponding, "baptism, also now saves us," by the resurrection of Jesus.

With Peter we began, and with Peter we shall end. Jesus gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven; he appointed him to announce the commencement of his reign, and told him, when he gave him the keys, "Whose sins soever you remit, they are remitted; and whose sins soever you retain, they are retained." We see how he remitted and retained sins when first he promulged the gospel. We need no other testimony than what Peter gives, on this whole question. Were we to expatiate on these passages as we have on Titus 3 & 5, what, and how many arguments might be adduced! But this we judge unnecessary here, and our prescribed limits forbid it. Such are the documents which teach us the meaning and design of Christian Immersion. It is on these we rely, and not on inferences, analogies, or remote reasonings. These all may illustrate and confirm, but the bare testimony of the Book, without note or comment, constitutes our plea; and on these alone we join issue with every opponent.

I have given a full specimen of the attempt of my Examiner to escape from their literal and figurative import. Some of them he professes not to understand; some of them he passes by; and with what point and logic he has attempted others, is now with the reader to judge.

Before we conclude, we shall cross-examine Paul and Peter on one question, as a sample how easy it is to meet all objections tendered from the frequency of commanding men to believe with a reference to salvation—

Thousands ask Peter, *What shall we do?* The Jailor asks Paul, *What shall I do?* TO BE SAVED, if the reader pleases. Peter says, Reform and be baptized, every one of you, &c. Paul answers, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, with thy family." How is this, Paul and Peter? Why do you not preach the same gospel, and answer the same question in the same or similar terms? Paul, do you preach another gospel to the Gentiles than that Peter preached to the Jews? What sayest thou, Paul? Paul replies—"Strike, but hear me. Had I been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, I would have spoken as Peter did. Peter spoke to believing and penitent Jews; I spoke to an ignorant Roman jailor. I arrested his attention after the earthquake by simply announcing that there was salvation to him and all his family through belief in Jesus." But why did you not mention repentance, baptism, the Holy Spirit? "Who told you I did not?" Luke says nothing about it; and I concluded you said nothing about them. Luke was a faithful historian, was he not? "Yes, very faithful: and why do you not faithfully hearken to his account? Does he not immediately subjoin, that as soon as I got the jailor's ear, I *spoke the word of the Lord to him and to all that were in his house?* Why you reason like a Paidobaptist. You think, do you, that the jailor's children were saved by his faith! I spoke the whole gospel, or word of the Lord, to the jailor and *to his family.* In speaking *the word of the Lord* I mentioned repentance, baptism, remission, the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, judgment, and eternal life: else why should I have baptized him and all his house, and why should he have rejoiced afterwards with all his family!!" Paul, I beg your pardon. I will not now interrogate Peter, for I know how he will answer me: he would say—"Had I been in Philippi, I would have spoke to an ignorant Pagan as Paul did, to show that salvation flowed through faith in Jesus; and when he believed this and repented, I would *then* have said, Be baptized for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Reader, what sayest thou: will Paul and Peter, or the Master of Paul and Peter, condemn me? Then do not thou condemn me. Adieu.

P. S. My friend Broaddus has both an Appendix and a Postscript to his examinations of the Extra. These treat of his views of divine influence, and contain his strictures on some pieces in the Harbinger. These we shall allude to in regular order, in our numbers, but it would be out of place here.

Cotner School of Religion
Lincoln 8, Nebraska

286.6
C15m
II
1831

9447
SL

Cotner School of Religion

286.6
C15m
II
1831

9447

AUTHOR Campbell (ed)

TITLE Millennial Harbinger

BORROWER'S NAME